THE WAR ON MODERN SCIENCE

THE WAR ON MODERN SCIENCE

OTHER BORZOI BOOKS

OF SCIENTIFIC INTEREST

ESSAYS IN POPULAR SCIENCE

BY JULIAN HUXLEY

TO BEGIN WITH

BY RAYMOND PEARL

LOVE AND MORALITY

BY JACQUES FISCHER

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH BY

CATHERINE ALISON PHILLIPS

THE WAR ON MODERN SCIENCE

A SHORT HISTORY
OF THE FUNDAMENTALIST ATTACKS ON
EVOLUTION AND MODERNISM

BY

MAYNARD SHIPLEY
PRESIDENT, THE SCIENCE LEAGUE
OF AMERICA

19 27

ALFRED · A · KNOPF · NEW YORK · & · LONDON

TEXAS EASTERN UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

COPYRIGHT 1927, BY ALFRED A. KNOPF, INC.

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEDICATED TO THE MEMBERS OF

THE SCIENCE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

It is the dispassionate view of nature that now holds the field. The Age of Evolution is one in which man has the post of an observer, of one, besides, keenly interested in watching the struggle of truth with error. To be in the firing line of the advancement of science is highly exciting. The fight against erroneous views is as real as any battle. Forces of opposition and bigotry are still here and still active, but at the present juncture to attempt to suppress any working hypothesis, such as organic evolution, is to play the part of one afraid to face reality.

WOODBRIDGE RILEY

From Myth to Reason

CONTENTS

PREFACE ix

INTRODUCTION: The Real Issue 3

CHAPTER 1: The Army of Reaction . . . 44

The Supreme Kingdom—The Bible Crusaders

CHAPTER 2: Mississippi's Humiliation . . 63

CHAPTER 3: Louisiana's Narrow Escape . . 75

CHAPTER 4: North Carolina: The "Pivotal State" 87

CHAPTER 5: The Threatened South . . . 111

South Carolina—Kentucky—Georgia—Florida—Alabama—Virginia—West Virginia—Maryland—Missouri—Arkansas—Texas

CHAPTER 6: The Shame of Tennessee . . 187

CHAPTER 7: Decivilizing California . . . 239

CHAPTER 8: These Benighted States . . . 282

New York—New Jersey—Massachusetts—Maine—Connecticut — Ohio—Michigan—Wisconsin — Minnesota—North Dakota—South Dakota—Indiana—

Iowa — Nebraska—Kansas—Oklahoma — Colorado —Utah—New Mexico—Arizona—Montana—Oregon —Washington—Hawaii—The Philippines—The District of Columbia.

CHAPTER 9: What is to Be Done? 370

APPENDIX 1 387

Speeches Delivered by Luther Burbank, Dr. David Starr Jordan, and Dr. William E. Ritter, at Mass Meeting of The Science League of America, November 14, 1924

APPENDIX 2 399

Prize-Winning Essays on "Why Evolution Should Be Taught in the Public Schools," Written by Prof. Horace B. English, Prof. Fay W. Clower, and Prof. Truman G. Reed

INDEX 405

PREFACE

HIS volume was prepared largely as a response to numerous letters received by the Science League of America, asking for authentic information regarding the nation-wide attempt of the self-styled Fundamentalists to debar the teaching of evolution from all educational institutions supported in whole or in part by public funds —i. e., "by taxation."

In two states of the Union—Tennessee and Mississippi—the teaching of evolution in schools, colleges and universities supported by the public has been made illegal by legislative action; in several other states similar bills have passed the Lower House, but failed of passage in the Senate; and in many other states arbitrary action has been taken by governors, state superintendents of public instruction, text-book commissioners, or city boards of education.

In Florida, Louisiana, Texas and Kentucky, all ref-

erences to evolution have been deleted from the state's text-books. In many sections of the Republic (even where little open discussion of the subject has occurred), many teachers have either lost their positions or have been so intimidated by the general attitude of the local community on the question of evolution that they have voluntarily forfeited their supposed right of freedom in teaching, and are studiously avoiding the subject. In many high schools throughout the country the name of Charles Darwin has ceased to be heard. This movement to outlaw any teaching that is in conflict with "the story of Creation set forth in the Book of Genesis" has even spread to the Philippine Islands; and the Fundamentalists assure us that the movement is to be world-wide.

Contrary to the expressions of "astonishment in England" with reference to the celebrated Scopes case, and the popular belief in this country that no such outbursts of intolerance could take place in Great Britain, the Dayton Inquisition was no sooner concluded than somewhat similar action was taken in a town much larger than Dayton, in Lancashire—viz., Bootle, a British manufac-

turing city of nearly 80,000 inhabitants. The chief difference in the two cases is that whereas in Dayton an unreasonable law was defied, in Bootle no teacher has so far been found who would dare make a test case of the ruling of the local board of education.

Even in far-off Jugoslavia, the evolution controversy has given rise to a heresy trial. Says *The Living Age* (May 17, 1924):

"Dr. Brana Petronievc, one of the foremost professors of Belgrade University, has fallen afoul of Jugoslav Fundamentalists over a question not altogther unfamiliar in countries far removed from Jugoslavia. For several months members of the university faculty have been giving daily popular lectures, and the unhappy Dr. Petronievc was so indiscreet as to discuss the origin of man. As he is very popular with his students and well known to the public, his lectures drew a great crowd.

"All went well so long as the Jugoslav scientist confined himself to outlining various anthropological theories now discarded. The trouble came when he began to discuss modern scientific theories. A religious organization for young men

promptly attacked the anthropologist for propagating immorality. The Women's Christian Movement supported its brothers. Since then the League of Priests has made an official appeal to the Ministry of Religion and Education to put a stop to lectures which tend to lower moral standards."

In this country the Fundamentalists are bitterly opposed not only to the scientific method as applied to study of the Hebrew Scriptures, but to the *method of science* in general: most of all, however, do they attack this method as applied to the origin and development of man.

Since all modern scientists are in agreement as to the overwhelming preponderance of evidence in favor of the theory—or fact—of organic evolution, the determination of twenty-five million or more thoroughly organized Fundamentalists to debar by law the teaching of evolution *even as a theory of biology* presents a very serious problem. But even more grave is the menace to freedom of teaching in general. Let it not be complacently assumed that the uprising of the uninstructed masses, in large sections of this nation, constitutes only a war on

evolution as such. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that we are in the midst of a war on the method of science as a whole, though more particularly on the method of science as applied in geology, biology, psychology, anthropology, sociology, and history.

In this book I have endeavored to sketch the history of the war on modern science during the past five years, and to present an analysis, by way of Introduction, of the philosophy upon which the inevitable conflict is based. I shall point out, incidentally, some of the more far-reaching results to be expected if the forces of traditionalism and obscurantism are permitted to carry out their program.

It may be well to state that the members of the Science League of America are in no sense responsible for anything said in this book. It is in no way to be regarded as an official report by the author as president of the Science League. Many members of the League would, very probably, favor a more conciliatory attitude toward the anti-evolutionists than is taken in this work; but that is not the personal point of view of its author.

Correction of any errors of fact which may have been made in the preparation of this volume would be gratefully received. Where names of persons or places are omitted, it means that they could not be mentioned without imperiling the positions of the individuals concerned.

MAYNARD SHIPLEY.

THE WAR ON MODERN SCIENCE

INTRODUCTION

THE REAL ISSUE

HE forces of obscurantism in the United States are in open revolt!

More than twenty-five millions of men and women, with ballot in hand, have declared war on modern science. Ostensibly a "war on the teaching of evolution in our tax-supported schools," the real issue is much broader and deeper, much more comprehensive in its scope.

The deplorable fact must be recognized that in the United States to-day there exist, side by side, two opposing cultures, one or the other of which must eventually dominate our public institutions, political, legal, educational, and social. On the one side we see arrayed the forces of progress and enlightenment, on the other the forces of reaction, the apostles of traditionalism. There can be no compromise between these diametrically opposed armies. If the self-styled Fundamentalists can gain control over our state and national governments—which is one of their avowed objectives—much of the best that has been gained in American culture will be suppressed or banned, and we shall be headed backwards toward the pall of a new Dark Age.

Centering their attacks for the moment on evolution, the keystone in the arch of our modern educational edifice, the armies of ignorance are being organized, liter-

ally by the millions, for a combined political assault upon modern science.

"To-day," says Hendrik Willem van Loon, "the house of science is a fortress besieged. The barbarian invasion of the last decade has swept away the outer line of defenses. And it will be many years before the damage can be repaired. In the meantime the soldiers of the garrison will have a double task. They will be called upon to continue their daily routine, without which the whole fabric of modern civilization would come to a speedy end. And, somehow or other, they will be obliged to safeguard the remaining walls against the attacks of our contemporary vandals."

It is imperative that it be fully recognized that a fight to the finish between science and dogma is now in progress throughout the United States. The Fundamentalists are well organized; they are in deadly earnest, believing as they do that their particular brand of religion cannot survive and flourish together with the teachings of religious liberalism and modern science. For the first time in our history, organized knowledge has come into open conflict with organized ignorance.

A commentator on the Scopes trial aptly remarked:

"On the one side are people owning a simple but unbending faith. On the other is a group which insists that data science has wrung from the laboratory, the earth and the stars shall not be suppressed. It was upon a similarly uncompromising front four centuries ago that the Reformation came about under Luther, Calvin and Knox. Equally stubborn later was the conflict between Cavalier and Roundhead. And now, after two generations in which friendships have been broken, families parted and churches wrecked over the irreconcilability of the theory of evolution with the first chapter of Genesis, they are going to court about it."

To the Fundamentalist, the validity of scientific conclusions, or the soundness of a theory based upon discovery and the systematization of knowledge, rests not upon ascertained facts and reasoned inferences, but upon the harmony of the conclusions of science with the theological dogmas of Fundamentalism. To the traditionalist, the stability and welfare of governments, along with the edifices of scientific research, rest upon theological "truths," not *discovered,* but *revealed* from on high. It is blandly affirmed in *Signs of the Times* (a Seventh Day Adventist paper claiming the largest circulation of any denominational weekly in the United States), that "there is never any doubt about any great problem when people look to God's Word for the solution, *and not to history or science.*"

To the scientific mind, knowledge—"truth"—is something to be gained by patient, laborious study and research. To the Fundamentalist mind, knowledge concerning the origin of the earth and the life upon it is something to be gained, not by research, but by means of ancient Hebrew writings, which the Fundamentalists assume to be literally "the Word of God." The Fundamentalist is already in possession of the solution of every "great problem," and no account need be taken of the lessons of "history or science." Knowledge results from the will to believe, not from the will to find things out for oneself.

In reporting the Scopes trial for *The Nation* (New York), Joseph Wood Krutch pointed out:

"The real problem raised is not legal but sociological. No verdict of the jury and no injunction of the Supreme Court

can change the fact that the trial is a symptom of the vast gulf which lies between two halves of our population, and that the real question to be settled is the question of how this gulf may be bridged. In the centers of population men have gone on assuming certain bodies of knowledge and certain points of view without realizing that they were living in a different world from that inhabited by a considerable portion of their fellow-citizens, and they have been unconscious of the danger which threatened them at the inevitable moment when the two worlds should come into conflict. In Tennessee the moment has arrived [1925] and a single battle will no more settle it than the World War settled the questions from which it arose.

"Of the reality of the danger there can be no question. The zeal of the Fundamentalists has been enormously quickened by an anticipatory taste of triumph, and they will push any victory they may gain to the fullest possible extent. Already one state legislator has announced his intention of 'putting teeth' in the present law by making the penalty for its violation a prison sentence instead of a fine, and various extensions of the principle of state interference with teaching may be confidently predicted."

A professor in a Fundamentalist college, writing in *Signs of the Times* (July 21, 1925), assures his readers—and pupils—that rationalism caused the fall of the human race.

"The rationalist philosopher may have been right when he denied the right of the papacy to dominate the consciences of men and to interpret truth for all, but he made just as great a mistake as the ecclesiastical rulers did when he exalted reason in the place of dogma."

This is the position taken by all Fundamentalists, of whatever denomination.

It is quite clear, as has been pointed out by the Rev. John H. Dietrich, of Minneapolis, that the present con-

flict between Science and Fundamentalism is the inevitable result of a clash between the method of science, which is discovery, and the method of Fundamentalism, which is the theological or traditional method known as revelation. In other words, it is a conflict between two directly opposed theories of the source and meaning of knowledge and of its value, and therefore an irreconcilable conflict between two opposing conceptions of what constitutes the proper (and lawful) method to be used in attaining knowledge and truth.

If the scientific and historical method is correct, then the Fundamentalist or traditional method is false and fruitless. Hence, say the Fundamentalists, scientific methods and results must not be taught in our schools and colleges; since, being in conflict with the method and results of revelation, the findings of scientific research must be false: that is, "contrary to the Word of God," which is literally in the possession of the Fundamentalists.

All that need be or can be known about the origin, nature and early history of man having already been *revealed,* research becomes unnecessary; the savant may put away his instruments, pack up his books, and go to —well, let us say, a "revival meeting." If he should persist in his researches, and insist upon making known the results of his patient labor and study, he must be fined or jailed as a criminal. This is the method of revelation, reinforced by the policeman's club, as opposed to the method of science, reinforced by what man is daily finding out.

While it is well known that no one living scientist of recognized standing in his profession doubts that things

came to be what they are found to be, by a process of evolution, of orderly change; nevertheless, what the friends of science are really supporting, or trying to protect, is not so much a unanimous conclusion of the scientists, as the validity of the method of science, and the moral right and duty of the scientists to make known to the students in our tax-supported schools the results of their researches.

Scientists, either individually or as a body, may be mistaken as to a matter of fact or as to a question of theory. But they cannot to-day be mistaken as to the question of method. It is not so much the doctrine of evolution that the Fundamentalist fears as it is the scientific method.

The superiority of the scientific method, then, as against the "revelation" of those afflicted with the disease of traditionalism (or, rather, of arrested development), lies not in the fact that science has attained true conclusions in so many cases, but in the fact that scientists have adopted the system of analyzing and formulating their assumptions on the basis of discovery—on ascertained facts. They have laboriously developed a technique for testing the validity not only of their theories and hypotheses, but even of their tentative "beliefs."

An assumption, or belief, based upon the facts so far as known, may—and does—often lead to a helpful working hypothesis; and the latter may, in turn, develop into an excellent and highly suggestive theory. Any theory adopted must, of course, not only account for the facts known, but it must also be (and always has been) changed, or abandoned when necessary, to conform to newly discovered data.

As Dr. Benjamin C. Gruenberg has well said, "When tradition implies that 'truth' is in some sense eternal, the science teacher must get people to realize that our knowledge grows by constant revision and adjustment of approximation to reality." We must, as he further remarks, "get people into the habit of asking, 'What are the facts in the case?' " ("Scientific Education as a Defense Against Propaganda and Dogma," address read before the Department of Scientific Instruction, National Education Association, Indianapolis, June 29, 1925).

It is the most valuable characteristic of the scientific method that it is always tentative and forward-reaching. The principles of science that entitle it to respect or confidence, as Dr. Gruenberg says, are "the reliance upon fact, the measurement and reproduction of fact, the honest facing of negative instances, the distinction between fact and theory, the experimental method, the frank acceptance of hypothesis as subject to revision, and the open mind ever ready to revise its postulates."

Charles T. Sprading aptly remarks that "knowledge consists in understanding the evidence that establishes the fact, not in the belief that it is a fact" ("Science versus Dogma," page 15). Again: "A scientific theory is a conception of the mind, based on ascertained facts, which aids in the discovery of other facts and accounts for them when discovered." The scientist is concerned with things that have been found out, the philosopher with things (real or imaginary) that have been thought out, and the Fundamentalist with "truths" that have been "revealed" and handed down by tradition—by "Authority."

Science, then, commands our respect, not on the basis

that its present assumptions and deductions are absolutely and for all time true, but on the ground that its *method* is for all time true—the method of discovery, the method of observation, research, experimentation, comparison, examination, testing, analysis and synthesis.

"But the mortallest enemy unto knowledge," said Sir Thomas Browne, "and that which hath done the greatest execution unto truth, hath beene a peremptory adhesion unto *Authority*, and especially the establishing of our beliefs upon the dictates of Antiquites. For (as every capacity may observe) most of Ages present, so supersticiously do looke upon Ages past, that the *Authorities* of the one excel the reasons of the other."

Herbert Parrish has shown that we are now living in a transition stage "from authority to experience," all along the line—in the political, social, and scientific fields.

"Religious authority," he says, "like the mediaeval mind, looks always backward, toward the past. Its wisdom, its mysteries, its experience with God, its miracles, its revelations, all took place centuries ago. It has held the world of thought in thrall for two thousand years. But, if God is the creative and controlling power of the universe, why confine His operations to the first few years of the Christian era? . . . If miracles ever happened, why should they not be happening now? Is truth confined to the studies of Augustine, Jerome, Basil, Hilary, Gregory, Chrysostom, the fathers of Nice, Ephesus, Constantinople, Calcedon, the traditions of the first six centuries? Excellent men and excellent traditions, no doubt. But has not this vast array of ecclesiastical authority been used as a blanket to stifle thought? A little freedom, good masters, from the fulminations of the theologues of the orthodox schools. Let us think out the interpretations for ourselves, untrammeled and *de novo*. Let us breathe the fresh air of this new morning without forever smelling the dust of obsolete libraries."

"The notions of authority and inspiration," remarks Prof. Edwin B. Linton (*Science*, February 12, 1926), "have reacted inextricably upon each other; they can hardly in their relations to Christianity be studied apart." He calls attention to a passage from Prof. A. E. J. Rawlinson, in which it is stated that:

> "The so-called Protestantism which for three hundred years dominated northern Europe, and in which our fathers for the most part believed, was not Protestantism at all, but only mutilated Catholicism. Its intellectual basis, that is to say, was equally authoritarian with that of Rome, from which it differed only in the substitution of the infallible Book for the infallible Church: a substitution which in itself was by no means an improvement. . . . Both infallibilities, we may say, are to-day discarded; the infallible Book has gone the way of the infallible Church."

This notion of "revealed truth" is what the late William Jennings Bryan had in mind when he told the court at Dayton that there is no such thing as a Bible expert, "so-called scholarship" in such matters being "rank infidelity." The opinion of a Bushman just converted is as good as that of the Bible scholar who has devoted a lifetime to the study of the text. After having declared to the world that the trial at Dayton was to be a duel to the death between science and religion, and that the monster of evolution was to be dragged out into the open, so that it could "no longer work in the dark" (!), Bryan refused to enter the contest which he had boastingly sought.

"The old Puritans," remarks Franklin Steiner ("Religious Treason in the American Republic"), "were Fundamentalists.

"The present ones believe that everything in the Bible should be taken as inspired, even the fly-leaves and the margins; that the first chapter of Genesis contains the beginning and the end of sound science. The Puritans of old were noted for their arrogance and tyranny, but not less so than those now of the United States, the only difference being that there is more knowledge in the world and that they do not possess the same power. They are trying hard, however, to regain it. The old Puritanism was the result of the lack of scientific knowledge that prevailed in its days. The present Puritanism would snuff out this knowledge as it would a candle that it might restore the old-time ignorance."

This attitude of mind accounts for the fact that the followers of Bryan do not hesitate to set up their own uninstructed opinion against the vast researches of modern science. (An interesting sidelight on the Bryanesque mentality is offered by the administrator's appraisement of the furniture and books in the reading room of this eloquent anti-evolutionist. The value was placed at $45.25, and that of the books and furniture in his study at $57.25, making a total of $102.50. The furniture must have cost more than the books. What were the books worth?)

The fact must be fully realized, then, that the conflict of to-day is, on the one hand, a battle between Modernists and Fundamentalists, and, on the other one, between Evolutionists and Traditionalists. Modernists, in the field of religion, employ the historical and scientific method of arriving at their conclusions; while Evolutionists employ the same principles plus experiment, observation, weighing and measuring, comparing, testing, deducing. "The situation, therefore, resolves itself," as Professor Linton observes, "into the inevitable conflict

between the scientific method of arriving at reasoned conclusions, and reliance upon an authority to which the attribute of infallibility is imputed."

It is notable that whereas the Fundamentalists demand absolute and demonstrable proof of every statement made in the name of scientific research, they by no means tolerate any suggestion looking toward even examination of their own "infallible" authority, called by them, without examination, "the Word of God."

"The proof that this collection of literature is the Word of God is that it possesses the qualities and powers that belong to such a Word. It is true and being true it appeals to our sense of the truth and approves itself to us." (Preface to the Holman pronouncing edition [King James version] of the Bible).

The fact that this collection of conflicting books betrays, in every chapter, that it does *not* possess the qualities "that belong to such a Word" has absolutely no meaning to a Fundamentalist.

"The real difficulty about the Bible in America," truly observes George Bernard Shaw, "is that though very few read it, everybody imagines that he knows what is in it. In Europe nowadays those who do not read it attach no importance to it and claim no authority for it. Those who do attach importance to it read it and know what it really says. But in America the Bible has become a figment of the American imagination.

"To Mr. Bryan and Mr. Butler [written during the Scopes trial] it is a book by a single omniscient and infallible author who has written for us a straightforward narrative in which there are no inconsistencies, no contradictions, no repetitions, no ambiguities, and in which there is only one God, who is the author in question.

"To those who have read the Bible it is not a book, but a literature written by a succession of authors, differing in their

religious beliefs, worshipping different Gods, representing different phases of civilization, writing hopelessly irreconcilable biographies of the same persons and histories of the same events, furiously denouncing one another's rituals as abominable in the sight of God and contradicting one another's views on his nature, and occasionally passing suddenly from Christian sentiments to outbursts of vindictiveness so atrocious that popular clergymen in London refuse to read them or allow them to be read in their churches, and bishops are appealed to by the most earnest of their flocks to have them struck out of the prayer book."

By their insistence upon the barbarous doctrine that "if the Bible and the microscope disagree, the microscope must be wrong," the Fundamentalists are doing more to drive intelligent young men and women from the church than are all the rationalist societies combined. Once repulsed by the shocking aversion to culture displayed by their own pastors, the awakened students come to look upon all religion as an obstacle to human progress. They speak of "the church," of "religion," not of Modernism and Fundamentalism, liberalism and orthodoxy. To take a case in point:

On February 2, 1926, there was a meeting of the Ministerial Alliance of Kansas. Upon the request of the ministers to learn the attitude of college students who are "outside the church" and critical toward it, Leonard Gregory, a nineteen-year-old student in the University of Kansas, gave the requested information—in quite plain language. To quote a few sentences from his "lay sermon":

"The church, at the present time, poses as the friend of education, but in reality the church is an impediment to intellectual progress. The church menace is not felt severely in large uni-

versities, but in this country there are hundreds of small denominational colleges which make orthodox Christian theology the foundation for all knowledge. This theology may have been harmless to the society that gave it birth centuries ago, but it is pernicious to try to accommodate it to present-day culture. The archaic creeds and dogmas are no longer a fit guide for right living. They are useless except as liturgy. In a small college intellectual freedom is almost entirely absent. Many of the small town high schools are controlled by teachers whose highest interests are in the church instead of the school. They raise the old Bible myths and legends to the level of science and history.

"I have talked with several college graduates who have gone out to teach in high schools and who have found no escape from the church. They are forced into it. In the class-rooms they must be ever on guard not to expose any religious ideas newer than the New Testament or any scientific knowledge concerning a period earlier than Adam. The case of Scopes, farcical if it did not involve such serious consequences, is only one of many examples of religious interference in education. The church is the Rock of Ages blocking the road to enlightenment. *We must make our schools safe from theocracy.*"

Here we have a striking illustration of the effects of Fundamentalist doctrine on the religious views of the youth of the land.

The Bible Crusaders, members of the Supreme Kingdom, and other Fundamentalists are appealing to the electorate, from the pulpit, by the radio, and in the press (including the columns of many secular dailies throughout the nation), to unite on a political platform having for chief objective the election of officials and legislators favorable to making illegal the teaching of evolution in the educational institutions of the country. They are heavily financed and are in deadly earnest.

The tax-payers, or their political representatives, the

Fundamentalists intend, shall be substituted for committees of scientists and educators to determine what text-books shall be used in our public high schools, colleges and universities.

As a natural corollary, teachers who insist upon interpreting the facts of geology, biology, anthropology, psychology or history from the evolutionary viewpoint are to be summarily dismissed. "The Bible condemns evolution, theistic evolution as well as materialistic evolution," said the now departed leader of the Fundamentalists; "and evolution must stand condemned as contrary to the revealed will of God." The teacher of history or sociology, as much as the teacher of science, must not mention any facts or events that might be construed as being incompatible with Fundamentalist theology. The Fundamentalists hold, in effect, that a legislature can by fiat establish the Genesaic story of Creation as a scientific fact, and that science must be taught, not in accordance with the findings of the scientist, but in accordance with their own dogmas.

This program, as will be shown in chapters to follow, is already being carried out to a far greater extent than the average citizen even suspects. Legislative action, while regarded as helpful to Fundamentalist designs, is by no means considered absolutely necessary to the fruition of Fundamentalist plans.

M. E. Tracy, the well known editorial writer, was moved by the anti-evolution propaganda to express himself in very plain words, relative to the activities of the late W. J. Bryan:

"There have always been men ready to pose as protectors of the universe, ready to persecute their fellow-beings, to strangle

thought, to destroy liberty of conscience. The Mathers preached New England into a witch hunt in order to prevent the devil from capturing it, as they declared. Socrates was murdered in a dignified, judicial way because Greek Fundamentalists conceived the notion that his ideas were corrupting the youth of Athens. Mr. Bryan and his followers play no new rôle, but represent the fear of demons come back in twentieth century garb. . . .

" 'Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live,' it is written, and if we must be literal in one respect, why not in others? The issue is not what we shall believe, but whether belief shall be a matter of law, whether our educational system shall be dedicated to the propagation of some beliefs and the suppression of others by statute.

"They talk about control of education as if education had been developed by authority, as if the art of writing, arithmetic, astronomy, biology and all the other branches had been perfected by state decrees. Tommyrot! We did not stumble on the idea of sanitation because a majority of tax-payers voted for it, but because some few men took advantage of the liberty to think. . . .

"Let us teach the boys and girls what we know, let us inspire them to think out and on from there, but let us close no door to the expansion of the intellect."

Commenting on the dangers to American civilization lurking behind such activities as Edward Young Clarke's Supreme Kingdom, *The New York Times* (April 6, 1926), says:

"Once again we see how the heels of civilization are always dogged by barbarism. One sometimes wonders whether the achievements of science, often so painfully attained, are really secure from generation to generation. Applied science may be safe, though some pessimistic minds have pictured a time of decadence when men would have forgotten how to make and operate the multitudinous machinery which science has made

possible. But science as a daring innovator, as one carrying the torch of truth into dark places, is more in danger."

Reading the various pamphlets and books of the anti-evolutionists (all of the writers of which are of the Fundamentalist persuasion), one might suppose that these fervent, if not modest, authors were qualified critics of the subject of their animadversions; one might be led to infer that the theory of evolution had been carefully and impartially investigated by men trained in the sciences of cosmology, geology, biology, anthropology, psychology, sociology, etc., and that this great doctrine had been weighed in the critical balance and found wanting.

As a matter of fact, not one living scientist of note is to be found among the authors of this mushroom growth of anti-evolution literature. The real scientists who are sometimes quoted by the Fundamentalist antagonists of evolution are (with the exception of those who wrote many years ago) unanimous in their endorsement of the validity of the theory of the origin of species by descent with modification.

But the clerical opponents of evolution, along with a few lay critics, would have the public believe that contemporary scientists are divided on this subject; or even that the theory of evolution has been abandoned by a large number of American and European palaeontologists, biologists, comparative anatomists, embryologists, anthropologists, sociologists, etc.

It is a significant fact that of these disingenuous publications, only one (written by a professor in a Roman Catholic college) is free from gross error or deliberate misrepresentation.

Dr. George Barry O'Toole, the author in question, undoubtedly has a fairly good reading knowledge of science—which cannot be said of any other living anti-evolution writer;—but he is, unfortunately, handicapped by acceptance of certain premises "as true" which have no relation to actual human experience, thus vitiating his arguments, which at times are curiously contorted in order to make them fit in with his traditional preconceptions. Not being a field geologist, nor a naturalist, he finds no difficulty in accepting the topsy-turvy Genesis "geology" of Fundamentalist George McCready Price, who owns as master only that eminent scientist known to folklore as Moses.

This is also the actual attitude of the Roman Catholic Church, clearly expressed by the Rev. Francis LeBuffe, S.J., of Fordham University—the institution which conferred upon Alfred McCann his doctor's degree in payment for his naïf "God—or Gorilla?" In a letter to *The New York Times* (July 19, 1925), Father LeBuffe says:

> "It is not correct to say that the question of evolution is an 'open question' to Catholics, or to anyone who believes in the Bible as the inspired word of God. . . . For it is a matter of faith, based on divine revelation as contained in the Bible and affirmed by the church, that the present human race began with one man and one woman, whom we call Adam and Eve. . . . I have written against the evolution of man, and my pamphlet 'Human Evolution and Science' has gone into its third edition. But I have not committed myself on the question of evolution of lower—i. e., non-man life."

The Right Rev. John J. Glannon, of St. Louis, may be cited as a higher authority: "Since religion may not be

taught in the schools," says the archbishop, "neither should certain teachings of science appear which are not only non-religious but anti-Christian"—meaning evolution. In other words, nothing that science discovers which is inconsistent with someone's religious creed should be allowed to reach the eyes or ears of the youth of the land. Dogmas must be protected by the State! "So far as Catholics are concerned, we have no such problems [of evolution] confronting us; no such questions vexing us, because we are all believers in Fundamentalism as I have explained it"—which he really did not. But he inferred that, like other Fundamentalists, the "Word of God"—in this case the Douay Bible—was to set the limits on science and thought, which he referred to as the "certain foundation" for all education.

With the single exception noted, anti-evolution books are grossly unscientific in temper, often deliberately mendacious, and are written with the sole purpose of winning the generality over to an attitude of contempt for the teachings of modern science—which they are pleased to call (after the author of the pseudonymous Pauline epistles) "science falsely so called."

Pretending to be showing the "utter absurdity" and "viciousness" of the doctrine of transformism, as such, these obviously disqualified critics of evolution quote (and frequently garble or misquote) conflicting passages from competent scientists. These passages are concerned with some problematical phase of expert investigations of the causes or methods of evolution. But they are so employed by the Fundamentalists that the reader is deliberately misled into the belief that the conflict

of expert opinion presented, respecting special problems, relates to a doubt as to the validity of the general theory of evolution; this notwithstanding the fact that *all* of the modern experts quoted fully recognize the process of evolution as nature's way of expressing her innate potentialities.

Now, as a matter of fact, these wily verbal adversaries of evolution are not in the least concerned about the validity of the theory of evolution as such; and only one of these rapidly-budding anti-evolution authors reveals even the slightest capacity for comprehending the scientific principles upon which the theory of evolution is based.

What the contemporary opponent of evolution *is* concerned with is the *method* by which the doctrine of orderly development was established, and the fact that the findings of modern science are at variance with the traditions of their parents and grandparents, and with "revealed truth."

Here we come upon the real issue.

The Fundamentalists are not interested in facts, in evidence; but in a theory—*their* theory, regarded by themselves as incontrovertible revealed knowledge.

The theory of evolution, and the evidences from which the theory was derived, are in conflict with the theory of the universe and of human nature adopted—without critical examination or adequate knowledge of known facts—by the dogmatic Fundamentalist; *therefore*, according to this school, the doctrine of evolution is not only erroneous in conception and based upon "science falsely so called," but it is pernicious, sinful and degrading, and its adoption can only lead, in the end, to

the overthrow of the government of the United States. For the (really secular) government of the United States is based, according to the Fundamentalists, not upon "the consent of the governed," as its founders believed, but upon the Bible—called by them "the Word of God."

"This country," declares *The King's Business* (February, 1925), official organ of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, "was founded on the Bible." Charles T. Spradling, in his valuable book, "Freedom and Its Fundamentals" (pages 60–61), quotes a Rev. Dr. Edwards who said: "We want a state religion, and we're going to have it. . . . It shall be revealed religion—the religion of Jesus Christ." He quotes also a statement of the Rev. Samuel Small, who expressed the Fundamentalist viewpoint—and objective—perfectly when he boldly declared:

> "I want to see the day when the church shall be the arbiter of all legislation, national, state and municipal; when the great churches of the country can come together harmoniously and issue their edict, and the legislative powers respect it and enact it into law."

From these citations, typical of hundreds of others, it is clearly revealed that the war on evolution and on Modernism is only a preparatory step toward the realization of the ultimate purpose of the Fundamentalist crusaders. This final objective is subjugation of our state and national governments, a virtual union of church and state under sectarian—Fundamentalist—domination. This was the avowed aim of the late William Jennings Bryan, although he used the term "Chris-

tian" instead of "Fundamentalist"—there being, in his opinion, no real Christians excepting those who subscribe to Fundamentalist dogmas.

It may here be recalled that Augustus Thomas, the well-known playwright, who nominated Bryan for president in 1908, told members of the Advertising Club of New York, on March 3, 1926, that before Bryan died he had prepared a constitutional amendment which would have made Christianity the official religion of the United States. "I saw," said Mr. Thomas, "the actual wording of the amendment, and because Bryan has died it does not follow that no attempt will be made to have it enacted. Bryan and I were good friends, but we came to the parting of the ways when he began to inject religious ideas into political matters."

But Bryan, speaking to the business men of Dayton, Tennessee (July, 1925), for the Fundamentalists generally, revealed clearly the ultimate purpose of the Fundamentalist movement. In reporting this speech for the Scripps papers, N. D. Cochran, a clear-headed political observer, said on this point:

"The final step will be compulsory teaching of the Bible in public schools and the establishment of Christianity as the state religion. That may seem to be an amazing statement, but it is a logical conclusion based on all that has preceded this Scopes trial and Bryan's speech. Moreover, his declaration of war against any theory that conflicts with the Bible involves a determination to nullify the bill of rights in the federal constitution wherever it may interfere with legalizing the teaching of the Bible in public schools and the police powers to carry out that purpose.

"Bryan dwelt on the power of the people to amend constitutions and to change courts and legislative bodies."

Bryan, as we shall see, was the real founder of the Bible Crusaders, and, in an indirect sense, of the Supreme Kingdom—an offshoot of the Ku Klux Klan. It should be noted, parenthetically, that when Bryan died, his demise was mourned by the Klan as that of "the greatest Klansman of them all." In Port Huron, Michigan, there is a William Jennings Bryan Chapter of the Ku Klux Klan.

All these Fundamentalist forces, organized under whatever names, have as an ultimate aim the founding of a united religio-political organization, made up, presumably, of various evangelical Protestant denominations, whose pope would occupy the presidential chair.

It is perhaps not generally known that it was the intention of "Imperial Giant, Imperial Wizard" Edward Young Clarke to establish a National Klan Church; as it is still the purpose of his successor, "Dr." Hiram Wesley Evans. "Simmons, Clarke and Evans, each and all shifting their church affiliations in keeping with their practices and habits, have had in mind the combination of all denominations in a Ku Klux Klan Church," says Edgar I. Fuller, former Executive Secretary to Clarke (*The Maelstrom*, page 30, 1925).

It may safely be taken for granted that the leopard has not changed his spots, and that the Supreme Kingdom, under Clarke, in tacit co-operation with the Bible Crusaders and Defenders of the Faith, is attempting now to gain control of the reactionary religious forces of America as well as to dominate our political and educational institutions. What Mr. Fuller says concerning the "Invisible Empire" doubtless applies with equal force to the Supreme Kingdom:

"It contemplates control of the political power of the nation, the electorate of the republic, the legislative and judiciary branches of organized government, the administration of the executive affairs of the country, and, finally, the mobilization of the Protestant church people of the nation into a Klan church. Nothing so stupendous has flashed upon the imagination of ambitious men in the ages that are past."

It is significant in this connection that the name at the head of the National Advisory Board of the (spiritually allied) Bible Crusaders of America is that of the recently defeated Representative W. D. Upshaw, of Georgia, still a Klansman, so far as is known.

"Mr. Upshaw's interest in the Klan dates back to the early days of the organization," says Mr. Fuller. "All through the movements and growth of the organization he has been closely identified with both E. Y. Clarke and Mrs. [Elizabeth] Tyler. Excerpts of correspondence by Upshaw to Mrs. Tyler, on the letterhead of the United States Congress, are printed herewith [in "The Maelstrom"] for the purpose of demonstrating how closely the Klan tied up with the political life of the state of Georgia and later with the politics of the nation" (page 52).

It is not merely a coincidence that the Supreme Kingdom had its origin in Atlanta, and that E. Y. Clarke was selected as its chief organizer, or that ex-Congressman Upshaw is also a prominent official of the Bible Crusaders.

There is a group of Fundamentalists, with headquarters in Pennsylvania, who have been demanding for some years that God and Christ be recognized in the preamble of the federal constitution. At one time these National Reformers came very near to getting their

amendments through the Senate. Their first petition was brought before the Congress in 1874, again in 1896, and in the 60th and 61st Congress in 1909. On March 13, 1926, the fourth attempt was made to make the United States Government Fundamentalist in law as well as (according to their claims) in fact. The petition was filed with Speaker Longworth of the House of Representatives by Congressman Stephen G. Porter, of Pennsylvania, who did not, however, recommend it for adoption. No action was taken on the petition. It contained, among others, the following paragraphs:

"This petition respectfully showeth:

"That in the otherwise excellent and admirable constitution of our country, we find no acknowledgment of the God of nations or the moral laws of His government. . . .

"That this defect encourages and teaches the false view [!] that the authority of the government is derived solely and ultimately from the will of the people, and not from the will of God, contrary to the express declaration of Holy Scriptures: 'There is no power but of God.' . . .

"That the Eternal Father has put the government of the world into the hands of the Lord Jesus Christ, that He is expressly declared to be 'King of Kings and Lord of Lords,' and that the refusal of this nation to acknowledge His authority and accept His law exposes us to the chastising and destroying judgments of God."

Here we have a straightforward declaration that the Fundamentalists are determined to overthrow our (secular) civil and political institutions and substitute for the government founded by the Fathers of the Republic a theocracy. Our government "of the people, for the people, by the people" is, so the Fundamentalists assert, "contrary to the express declaration of Holy Scrip-

tures," as the ensuing comparison (made by Dr. M. M. Mangasarian) will plainly show:

The Constitution Teaches:	St. Paul Teaches (Romans xiii, 1, 2):
That all political power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority, and instituted for their benefit; and that they have at all times an undeniable and indefeasible right to alter their form of government in such manner as they may think expedient.	"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation."

The objective of the Fundamentalists of all denominations is the substitution of the Asiatic Pauline theology in the United States for the American Republic of Washington, Jefferson, Paine, Franklin, Madison and the other founding fathers. They contend that our government was founded upon the Bible, and some modern statesmen and publicists (who ought to know better) ignorantly or hypocritically concede the point.

Yet the Director-General of the Bible Crusaders and Defenders of the Faith, George F. Washburn, himself recently declared:

"Many citizens of the United States are probably not aware that the name of God appears not a single time in our national constitution. This is a fact, nevertheless. The omission of God's name from our original constitution was due to the influence of Tom Paine, Voltaire, and a few other Atheists. [The fact that neither Paine nor Voltaire was an Atheist is always "forgotten" by Fundamentalists.]

"In order that the United States, fundamentally a Christian

nation, may acknowledge its God in its constitution, as much as on its coins, the Bible Crusaders intend to ask the next national Congress to adopt a constitutional amendment inserting the name of God."

If the Fundamentalist forces can gain control of our political and judicial institutions, our country will ere long be converted into a relentless Fundamentalist theocracy, under which religious and academic freedom will eventually be totally suppressed. The day may come when no Catholic, Jew, Modernist or Agnostic will be eligible to a teaching position in any tax-supported educational institution; just as even now, in many sections of the country, no avowed evolutionist can secure a position in the high schools. (Although five states prohibit inquiry of prospective teachers, as to their religious affiliations, this law is universally evaded, and such questions are regularly asked.)

Says a leading Fundamentalist, The Rev. Dr. E. J. Bulgin:

"Any man that does not believe the Bible, including the Book of Genesis, and opposes its being taught in the schools [as opposed to scientific explanations of the origin of the earth and its inhabitants] is a traitor to his country."

This public declaration gives timeliness to a paragraph from John E. Remsburg's "Six Historic Americans":

"Paine, Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Franklin, Madison, Hamilton, Jackson, Lincoln, Grant. How light would be the volume of American history did it not contain the names and deeds of these illustrious men; how frail the temple of American liberty without these ten grand pillars. They are the

landmarks that mark the successive stages in the founding and development of our great republic—the great and central figures around which clusters the most that is grand and glorious in our country's history—the bright stars that glitter in the broad field of our political firmament. And yet, not one of these great names appeared upon the roll of a Christian church." (A few, like Washington, attended church, but were not communicants.)

According to some of the most outspoken Fundamentalists, not one of these Founders was fit to teach in our public schools—they were all "traitors to their country"! They were all "unbelievers" in the Book of Genesis as a literal scientific account of the origin of the earth and of man. On the other hand, as the Crusaders well know, not one of the Founders was an Atheist—any more than he was a Fundamentalist.

Fundamentalism is a word coined by the Rev. Dr. Curtis Lee Laws, in 1921, and the "Christian Fundamentals," as understood by Laws, Massee, Straton, Riley, Norris, and Fundamentalists generally, are the following five minimum basic doctrines:

1. The inerrancy and infallibility of the Bible.
2. The Virgin Birth and the complete Deity of Christ Jesus.
3. The resurrection of the same body of Jesus which was three days buried.
4. The substitutionary atonement of Jesus for the sins of the world.
5. The second coming of Jesus in bodily form, according to the Scriptures.

In the eyes of the Fundamentalist, any citizen of the United States who is not willing to subscribe to the above doctrines is not only not fit to serve as a school

teacher or a college professor, but is also *a traitor to his country*.

No lover of liberty would seek to deprive even the most rabid Fundamentalist of his right to freedom of speech. But when he seeks to apply a religious test to any law-abiding, properly educated citizen applying for a position as a teacher in our public schools, it is high time to object! The constitution of the United States provides that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States," and the individual states have, nearly all of them, followed this enlightened principle in drafting their own constitutions. Now, a teacher in a public institution is a public official, and Franklin Steiner is quite right when he makes the following declaration:

> "When it is said that, while teaching any branch of knowledge, he must instruct in accordance with the teachings of any religion or any text-book of religion, thereby is prescribed for him a religious test. No one can escape this conclusion."

But a "religious test" is precisely what the Crusaders are determined to impose. "The chief thing for us to do," says *The Christian Reformer* (quoted by Sprading, "Freedom and Its Fundamentals," page 60), "is to demolish the secular theory of government and reconstruct the constitution on a Christian [i. e., a Fundamentalist] theory."

The Fundamentalists hold, with the Pope, that governments founded without the participation—which means the control—of the church and clergy are unworthy of respect, and they have therefore set about changing this one. They agree with Pius XI that states which do not

officially recognize their particular religion are "pests of society."

In an Encyclical issued in Rome on December 23, 1925, the Chief Pontiff gave expression to the hope that "if Christ, the king, be venerated by all the Catholics of the world," that "pest with all its errors will be removed." He declared that for a long time the empire of Christ over all the peoples has been denied, even "the right of the church, which springs from the right of Christ to teach the people, give them laws and rule them in order to lead them to eternal happiness." Indeed, he added, the church has submitted to civil power, there having even been a state which thought it could do without God and whose religion consisted in "lack of religion in contempt of God." He concluded by claiming for the church "full liberty and independence from civil power."

The Fundamentalists are, of course, anti-papal, and if there is to be any ecclesiastical rule in this republic they would insist that it be evangelical Protestant, and Fundamentalist. They already exercise a tremendous influence on our state and national governments, and there is no reason for assuming that they have reached the peak of their power.

Rollin Lynde Hartt, writing in *The Nation* for July 22, 1925, has very clearly stated just what the present situation is:

"Under a republic such as the framers of the constitution supposed that they were founding, twenty-five million Fundamentalists would not be a particularly grave menace. Representatives, chosen for their wisdom and good conscience, were to legislate in accordance with their wisdom and good con-

science, ignoring 'the mob.' But though the capital is still at Washington, remote from great centers of population, and though an electoral college still goes through the ancient ceremony of choosing the President, lest 'mob' influence should prevail, we long ago abandoned the republican form of government. The mob rules. Of this or that obnoxious bill, a Congressman or Senator will say frankly: 'I don't believe in any such measure, but I shall vote for it because I learn that my constituents desire me to.' For this he is not only unrebuked, he is applauded.

"No one foresaw that America would change from a republic to a democracy. To-day, it seems ridiculous to hint that America may in course of time change from a democracy to a theocracy. But only a short while ago it would have seemed as ridiculous to predict that a former Secretary of State, holding honorary degrees from several institutions of learning, would one day be defending a twenty-three-hundred-year-old Chaldean creation myth, and in so doing, advocate the principles of theocratic despotism."

That there has been a gradual encroachment of certain elements in the evangelical Protestant sects on the provinces of the State—and even on the liberties of the individual—has been clearly shown by A. Washington Pezet (*The Forum*, September, 1926), who made a personal investigation of conditions in the National Capital. To quote a few words in point:

"The Temporal Power of Evangelism,—the very phrase is absurd. Every American of average education knows that, historically, temporal power means the authority of the Roman Catholic Church exerted outside of the religious sphere, in the secular field of politics and government. He knows, too, that the Evangelical Protestant sects are those which, in theory at least, have traveled farthest from the Catholic ideal and policy of authority. He knows that his ancestors came to this virgin continent in search of religious freedom. . . .

"Yet if we read history dispassionately, we see that the exercise of temporal power has not been confined to any one religious sect. While Protestantism is philosophically a repudiation of temporal power, Protestant sects have, time and again, repudiated their own philosophy. The Calvinists in Geneva and the Puritans in New England are conspicuous examples out of the past.

"After the overthrow of the Puritan Theocracy in Massachusetts, temporal power was banished from this land. Its return has been gradual and almost imperceptible. The New England Abolitionists, Puritans by descent and temperament, were the first to inject religion into our national politics."

One denomination alone has at least eight members who were at this time virtually official representatives in the Congress, four of whom were in the United States Senate—Capper of Kansas, Fess of Ohio, Jones of Washington, and Willis of Ohio; besides, they counted in the House Hoch of Kansas, Lineberger of California, Robinson of Ohio, and Smith of Idaho. These are what leaders of the denomination call "key men," in the various "strategic centers." They are members of a Board—the Methodist Board of Temperance, Prohibition and Public Morals—which is admittedly "an official agency of the church." Says Mr. Pezet:

"The Board assumes that it speaks officially for over fifteen million people. Its personnel consists of a Methodist Bishop, the Chairman; five ministers, one of whom is also a judge and the Board's very able General Secretary and real executive; four United States Senators; four members of the House of Representatives; one major-general in the United States Army; another judge; and seven other gentlemen among whom are several lawyers. In its very make-up a perfect liaison between the Church and State. . . . To appreciate the real significance of the Board, however, we have only to imagine the hue and

cry, the alarums and discursions, the gathering of Klansmen, the deluge of hysterical pamphlets, the intemperate 'save-the-country' editorials and speeches that would be let loose in the land were there a Catholic Building in Washington, housing a Catholic Board with a Catholic Bishop at its head, an able Jesuit as its General Secretary, and four United States Senators and four members of the House of Representatives as its political advisers. But is not temporal power temporal power no matter by whom exercised?"

Mr. Pezet then goes on to prove that the existence of such a Board implies an exercise of temporal power:

"The Senators and Representatives, members of the Board, when on the floor of Congress are in a position to sponsor the point of view of the Board as if it were their own; to urge it upon any committees of the Senate and House of which they may be members; and to influence their colleagues in Congress by personal appeals and by those methods of back-scratching which are common features of present-day legislative technique."

Claiming to represent the "vast majority" of the voters of this country, this organization exercises, in the name of religion, an undue influence in national affairs through political methods. But, as Mr. Pezet points out, this body does *not* represent a majority opinion on any public question—excepting the drug traffic. The figures below speak for themselves:

"The total adult population of the United States is 60,886,-520. Of these sixty millions, only 26,077,091 are members of Protestant Churches. There are 18,260,793 Roman Catholics, 20,170,294 who belong to no church, and a scattering of Unitarians, Mormons, Christian Scientists, Hebrews, and others. Certainly the Board cannot presume to speak for Catholics, whose point of view on many subjects is so diametrically op-

posite. Neither can it speak for the nominal Christians, the Agnostics and Atheists who number twenty millions. Nor can it claim to speak for all Protestants, for there are several million Episcopalians and Lutherans who do not share its views. At most it speaks for twenty-two million Evangelists. I am not aware that twenty-two is a 'vast majority' of sixty."

We have to deal here with "a political organization of a religious minority which, through its activities and propaganda, is striving to secure political action favorable to its special point of view"; thus exercising temporal power in the name of a sectarian church organization. Former Assistant Attorney General William H. Lamar, himself a communicant of the Methodist Church, truly declared: "This country is now in the control of Protestant organizations as effectually as the Roman Catholic Church ever controlled any country."

Mr. Pezet closes his timely article in these words:

"Washington, Jefferson, all the Founders in fact, were at one on the necessity for a complete separation of Church and State. Men of background and vision, they knew that free government is impossible if any group arises within the State powerful enough to challenge its authority. They knew, too, that of all such groups none is more dangerous to liberty than the Church. Protected by its holy mission from salutary criticism, and sustained by the emotional power of the simple faith of good people, the Church becomes the instrument through which the people may become the destroyers of their own liberties.

"It is our tragedy that we of to-day seem to have forgotten this most poignant of history's lessons."

Charles Merz (in *The New Republic,* October 13, 1926), who also made a special investigation of religio-political conditions in Washington, came to virtually the

same conclusion as was forced upon Mr. Pezet. But Mr. Merz sees a closer relationship between Ku Klux Klan politics (and methods) and the Methodist Board than was pointed out by Mr. Pezet. To quote an illuminating statement:

"Certainly it would be short-sighted to lump millions of Methodists in this country behind one board in Washington and suggest that they know all about this board, and know all that it is doing. . . . But it would also be short-sighted to study the record and not be impressed by evidence on three points:

"First, between this Board and the Klan there is at least enough identity of interest, in a common hostility to 'big-city morals,' 'foreigners,' 'Modernism,' etc., so that the Board has never denounced the Klan, though it has denounced many other things, and though the Klan has been a burning issue for at least five years.

"Second, by its own admission this Board keeps a record of the 'religious and fraternal affiliations' of every Congressman. So does the Klan. Both spot their Catholics, their Knights of Columbus, their Methodists, their Baptists. Why? The Board may argue, as it does argue, that all this is simply necessary information in each man's case 'which will aid us in understanding him and his probable action in any contingency.' But what is a 'contingency' if not a supposedly democratic vote in Congress or in a free election? And what is a Methodist Board or any other church board doing when into its campaigns for legislation it introduces the question of 'religious and fraternal affiliations'?

"Finally, it seems clear that if the Methodist Church is in fact to dissociate itself from Klan methods and Klan results, then the Methodist Church will have to look sharp not only in Washington but in more than one of its small-town pastorates. For if one reads the Klan press, Methodism is there—in small informal friendly incidents—at every corner. The thing is unmistakable. Here is the Ku Klux Klan of Mechanicsburg,

Pa., coming in to the Methodist Church, and the Rev. Harry Daniels delivering a sermon on Great Patriotic Movements. Here is the Ku Klux Klan of Mantua, N. J., arranging a special service in the Methodist Church, and the pastor turning his church over to the Grand Dragon. Here is the Ku Klux Klan of Potomac, Va., dropping in on the Methodist Church, two hundred strong, and a Klan speaker addressing the congregation on the ethics of his order. Here is the pastor of the Methodist Church in Lima, Ohio, delivering a sermon on the principles of Klancraft. Here is the Ku Klux Klan of Staunton, Va., descending on the Methodist Church in full regalia, and the Rev. J. C. Bolton preaching to the Ku Klux Klan of Easton, Pa., and the Rev. C. B. Wagner preaching to the Ku Klux Klan of El Paso, Ill. Here is the Ku Klux Klan of Kersey, Pa., marching into the Methodist Church, presenting the Rev. C. P. Hulburn with a purse, thanking him for a task well done, and marching out to the strains of Onward Christian Soldiers. . . . One could go on adding incident to incident. For this is but the beginning of a record, clipped casually from a single source in a single month, of an entente cordiale too significant to be ignored, a friendly alliance of Church and Klan in many a smaller town to which a steady train of such events bears evidence.

"One wonders. Is it this background of smouldering resentment against big cities, liberalism by any name, 'evolution,' 'foreigners,' and kindred ogres of the Ku Klux Klan which sets the pace for the Methodist Board in Washington? Or has the Methodist Board in Washington waxed so well as to have left its imprint on its background?

"To this query the first experiment of a church board in active politics has brought us."

In his Kansas City address before the American Association for the Advancement of Science (1925), Prof. Edwin B. Linton, then of the University of Georgia but now of the University of Pennsylvania, referred to the rider attached by Congress to the appropriation bill,

prohibiting the teaching of anything implying disrespect to the Bible in the schools of the District of Columbia, and said:

"I am informed that the Fundamentalists, having obtained a majority in Congress, have had prepared a very strict anti-evolution bill for introduction into the new Congress which will prohibit the teaching of anything of the sort at Annapolis, West Point, or in the schools of the District of Columbia."

We have already seen that the Methodist Board in Washington includes at least eight national law-makers who can be depended upon to back an anti-evolution law. To this must be added the following solons, members of the International Advisory Council of the Bible Crusaders and Defenders of the Faith—all ardent anti-evolutionists: Senator Trammell of Florida, and Congressmen Drane of Florida, Wilson of Mississippi, Allgood of Alabama, Rowbottom of Indiana, Hammer of North Carolina, Edwards of Georgia. Upshaw of Georgia is also a member of the Council; he was recently defeated for re-election, but has very probably been succeeded by another anti-evolutionist.

Now, it is the avowed purpose of both the Supreme Kingdom and the Bible Crusaders, backed by the vast majority of Ku Kluxers, and by all Fundamentalists, to aid in the election to the Congress of only such men or women as are known to be *religiously* anti-evolutionists. It would seem possible that within the next ten years or so a majority in Congress will vote for a federal anti-evolution amendment, and that this reactionary legislation will be supported not only by the organizations

just mentioned, but, by that time, even by the Methodist Board (whose Executive Secretary, Clarence True Wilson, is a member of the Advisory Council of the Bible Crusaders).

"Does anyone suppose," asks W. T. Withrow, "that, having gained their first objective, the Fundamentalist fanatics will be content to stop there? Verily, they will not. . . . Nor will they stop with the mere throttling of education. They may be confidently expected to invade, with even greater gusto and fanatic fervor, the domain of personal liberty. . . .

"Individuals, as well as schools, will be forced by law to be religious according to the established Fundamentalist code. Swinging the pendulum of history backward through three centuries, they will re-enact the old puritan laws of compulsory church attendance. . . . Houses will be searched periodically for scientific literature, and any such books or papers found will be publicly burned, and their owners imprisoned. . . .

"All this is no wild-eyed nightmare of a fevered imagination. It represents the perfectly logical development of the present Fundamentalist activities, in case those activities are successful. So far they have been even more successful than anybody, two years ago, would have thought possible in a supposedly enlightened country. . . .

"Naturally, with this stimulus, they will follow up as rapidly as possible, and in every direction possible. . . . If we value freedom, peace and progress, we must stop this crusade, for, if it succeeds, it will banish freedom, peace and progress from this nation, for another century."

The late Thomas R. Marshall, former Vice-President of the United States, speaking in Montclair, New Jersey, said he was in favor of a law making Bible-reading and church attendance compulsory. He did not state just what

penalty he desired to see imposed for wilful disobedience to his proposed law.

The Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff, president of the American Committee for Revision of the King James version of the Bible, recognized the indubitable fact, amply attested by history, that "the principle of the persecution —to the extent of burning heretics—is inseparable from the union of church and state." True, the general advancement of civilization seems now to have rendered a return to this awful practice impossible. On the other hand, the present immunity of the "heretic" may be far more due to the diversity of sects, and the *auto-da-fé* may again become popular should any one sect or group of closely related sects become powerful enough to capture the government.

Lest it be thought that Mr. Withrow's and Dr. Schaff's strictures are too severe, the following editorial from *The Los Angeles Examiner* of December 24, 1923 (quoted by Sprading, "Science versus Dogma," page 119), may prove enlightening:

"A correspondent of *The Greensboro Daily News* [North Carolina] recommends drastic action against 'evolutionists and no-hellers.' This vigorous Protestant inquisitor roars 'as gently as a sucking dove.' He stands for no nonsense. For instance, he says:

" 'The evolution idea has poisoned, and is poisoning, the minds of more people who are fools enough to listen to it. "Truth Seeker" has given his remedy for war. [The World War, the reader must understand, was, according to Fundamentalists, caused by the teaching of the theory of evolution.] I will give mine. Take the evolutionists, infidels and no-hell teachers out somewhere and crucify them, head downward, and we will have a better country to live in and, instead of these evolution

and easy-way ideas, teach people the Word of God to go by, and all will be well.'

"This is not the first gentleman who has seen clearly the shortcut to the millennium by the way of the sword."

It is an easy transition, for the Fundamentalist mind, to pass from outlawing evolution to declaring the evolutionist an outlaw, deserving to be hanged or burned at the stake. Let us take another example in point:

"Our contention," says the Rev. Dr. William Bell Riley ("Inspiration or Evolution," page 17), "is that in its conception, development and application, evolution is utterly false; as false to science as to Scripture; and so Scripture and this unproven and unprovable hypothesis can never speak together. . . . Truth is the embodiment of intolerance! . . . God's word is truth! . . . (Page 130) I confess to you frankly, if it were in my power, I would take every false [non-Fundamentalist] teacher out of every pulpit and professorship in the land. . . . When James and John saw the Samaritans reject Jesus, they wanted him to command fire to come down from heaven and consume them as Elias did. Was it to their discredit? Of judgment [i. e., in the matter of "getting away with it"], yes! Of spirit, no!"

This is the "spirit" of Fundamentalism everywhere and in all times.

"The old Romish practice of burning dissenters at the stake was turned against the English Catholics to suppress that sect entirely. Henry's Romish daughter 'Bloody Mary' succeeded him, and she was in turn succeeded by her Protestant bar-sinister sister Elizabeth: each in turn kept the fires of Smithfield blazing with the burning of 'heretics' of the opposite faith" (Joseph Wheless, "Is It God's Word?" 1926, page 15).

In spirit, both Protestant and Roman Catholic Funda-

mentalism view the state as a divine instrument through which they may function in the name of "the Word." Mr. Wheless quotes the following paragraph from the 1907 edition of the Catholic Encyclopedia—a paragraph which precisely expresses the spirit of Protestant Fundamentalism in the United States to-day (from Vol. XIV, page 761, ff.):

"Nearly all ecclesiastical legislation in regard to the repression of heresy proceeds upon the assumption that Heretics *are in wilful revolt against lawful authority* [all italics are Wheless's]; that they are, in fact, *Apostates* who by their own *culpable act* have renounced the True Faith. . . . No one could be ignorant of the *claims* of the Church; and if certain people repudiated her *authority*, it was by an *act of rebellion* inevitably carrying with it a menace to the sovereignty which the rest of the world accepted. . . . 'The gravest obligation,' says Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical '*Immortale Dei*' of November 1, 1885, '*requires the acceptance and practice not of the religion which one may choose, but of that which God prescribes and which is known by certain and indubitable marks to be the only true one*'!"

With this doctrine every true Fundamentalist agrees; hence we are not surprised when we read that the Director General of the (Protestant) Crusaders suggests a union of Roman Catholic and Protestant Fundamentalist forces to carry out, by aid of the state constabulary and courts, the ordinances of God as conceived by themselves. On at least four cardinal doctrines, Romanism and Fundamentalism are in agreement, besides the theory that ours is "a Christian government, founded upon the Bible." (And yet it was President George Washington himself who said [in his Treaty with Tripoli]: "The government of the United States of

American is not, in any sense, founded upon the Christian religion.")

The background of Fundamentalism has now been sketched. A brief survey of the sinister and reactionary forces now being organized in this country for the purpose of establishing a virtual union of Church and State (to the detriment of science) may serve to show that one need not be an alarmist to recognize that a turning-point in the history of the United States has been reached, and that the forces of progress are face to face with a grave peril to our modern civilization.

CHAPTER I

THE ARMY OF REACTION

AVING set forth the real causes of the war on modern science and on Modernism, let us turn now to an inspection of the army of reaction.

While the people of the United States are peacefully pursuing their usual vocations, there are being organized under their very eyes two of the most pernicious movements in the history of the modern world. If the ambitious plans of their founders are carried to successful completion, the result must eventually be the overthrow of our present form of secular government and the throwing back of the general culture of this country to that of several centuries ago. I refer to the Supreme Kingdom and the Bible Crusaders of America.

While these two associations are legally separate and distinct, and disclaim connection with each other, they have a common objective; namely, legal suppression of the right of teachers to expound the theory of evolution; moral or economic annihilation of Modernism in any and all of its manifestations; and the ultimate establishment in this Republic of a Fundamentalist Theocracy.

THE SUPREME KINGDOM

The Supreme Kingdom, inaugurated only in 1926, is already becoming a formidable rival of the two competing Klan organizations. By the beginning of April, 1926, charters had been issued in about thirty cities, chiefly in the south and west; though progress was also reported in Massachusetts and other New England states.

The reputed founder is Edward Young Clarke, previously mentioned as Imperial Wizard Emeritus of the Ku Klux Klan. But the idea of the Supreme Kingdom had been developed in conference with Bryan, by Roscoe Carpenter, of Indianapolis, according to Carpenter's own testimony. He it was who selected Clarke as leader. Among other leading representatives of the Supreme Kingdom are Franklin B. Slater, of Chicago; Perry Pryor, of Kansas City; and Ernest Miller, of Atlanta. Fred W. Taylor is "Minister of Organizations." Sectional organizations are to be established in the above-named cities and also in Boston, Indianapolis, and elsewhere. A statement made in June, 1925, by William H. Anderson, whose service as superintendent of the New York Anti-Saloon League was ended by conviction of third-degree forgery and a prison sentence, suggests that he also is one of the promoters of this secret Fundamentalist and anti-evolution order: he announced at that time the early "launching of a new and unique national Protestant movement." Anderson may, however, have meant the Bible Crusaders.

The first public organization meeting was held in January, 1926, in Atlanta, when Clarke was introduced by

Carpenter as national organizer. Carpenter, as principal speaker of the occasion, was himself introduced by Mayor Walter Sims, of Atlanta, who declared that he welcomed any movement to Atlanta that "has for its object the fostering of the beliefs of our fathers."

In his address, Carpenter said that the new national organization "must control the medium which controls the people, whether it be the newspaper, the motion picture, or what," including the schools and colleges of the nation. Denouncing evolution, he stated that "the schoolroom is no place to expound an experimental theory." Resolutions were passed unanimously at the meeting, condemning the teaching of evolution in the schools, and it was resolved to call upon "patrons of such institutions to demand removal of any teachers who teach these destructive doctrines."

"The crime wave" and "general unrest" of the youth of the nation Carpenter ascribed to Modernism in general and to the doctrine of evolution in particular.

> "This thing we call Modernism, modern education and evolution are all bound up in one package, and we must deal with the three as one. It is the theory of evolution which has swept the country that is causing the very foundations of liberty, morals and Christianity to totter."

High praise was given by both Carpenter and Mayor Sims to the late Colonel Byran for his fight on evolution. According to the Atlanta press, Carpenter said that he had not only been closely associated [as a Klansman?] with Bryan during the four years preceding his death, but had recently been "in close contact with

Henry Ford, who is also opposed to the teaching of evolution." It was at this point that Clarke was introduced; and he assured his hearers that the theory of evolution is utterly false, and demoralizing in its results.

Plans were then outlined for the establishment of anti-evolution organizations in every town and city in the United States and Canada, as well as in Australia. Indianapolis was selected as the "educational center" of this anti-evolution movement, with general headquarters in Atlanta, and a recreation home was to be established in Florida "for those who grow old in the war against evolution."

It has since been announced that the Supreme Kingdom intends to erect a large radio broadcasting station atop either Lookout Mountain or Signal Mountain, near Chattanooga, Tennessee, to be used in the anti-evolution campaign.

Thus was launched what has since developed into the secret order known as the Supreme Kingdom. If the public announcements concerning it are to be accepted at their face value, the organization is more liberal, in some respects, than is the Klan. Since its attacks are to be limited to evolution, Modernism, and "Bolshevism," Catholics and Jews are eligible to membership, if of Fundamentalist persuasion in general. Its chief mission will be to drive Modernists and evolutionists out of the churches and schools, and to see to it that "only God-fearing men and women who believe in [the Fundamentalists'] God, and in the Bible as His inspired word to mankind, *will be allowed to hold public*

office of any kind in the United States"—which places this un-American organization in direct conflict with the United States Constitution.

Clarke was quoted by *The Post*, of Birmingham, Alabama (March 1, 1926), as saying, in a public speech in that city, that:

> "In another two years, from Maine to California and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, there will be lighted in this country countless bonfires, devouring those damnable and detestable books on evolution."

A questionnaire is being sent to teachers, office-holders, and ministers, asking their position on evolution, Atheism, and "Anarchism." By establishing "Castles" in all the large cities of the nation, "a good dose of the oldtime religion of our forefathers" (the phrase suggests the castor-oil of the Fascists!) is to be administered to the entire populace; and all persons opposed to the Supreme Kingdom and its tenets are, whenever and wherever possible, to be starved into accepting "the oldtime religion."

In January, 1927, it was announced that the Supreme Kingdom was about to make a big drive for membership and money, and had engaged the Rev. Dr. John Roach Straton, New York's valiant Fundamentalist orator, and prominent in the Bible Crusaders, to deliver sixty lectures for a fee of $30,000. This announcement caused dissension in the Calvary Baptist Church, of which Dr. Straton is pastor, and force was lent to the objections when *The Telegraph*, of Macon, Georgia, published documents showing that of the $12.50 paid for membership in the Supreme Kingdom only $2.37½ went to the

avowed purposes of the society, $8.12½ being eaten up by Clarke himself. At the same time *The Telegraph* claimed that the Supreme Kingdom was acting as an *agent provocateur*, as it printed and distributed (without permission) literature of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, sent it to Fundamentalists throughout the South, and then followed it up by its own propaganda. Moreover, the paper stated, Dr. Straton had been asked to examine these documents before he spoke in Macon under the auspices of the Supreme Kingdom, and refused, saying he was not "preaching or lecturing for money"—whereas he had taken a fee of $500 for a previous talk in Atlanta.

In the face of these revelations, Dr. Straton promptly "got out from under." He announced that he had merely joined the "pioneer division" of the Supreme Kingdom, and that he had now resigned from that. His avowed reason was given as pressure of pastoral duties!

The Supreme Kingdom now has organizations in sixteen states. It held its first annual convention in St. Louis in March, 1927. It publishes an organ aptly named *Dynamite*. In furtherance of its drive for four million members, Clarke is at this writing touring the country, his first objective being Minnesota, where Fundamentalist sentiment is very strong.

There are many other anti-evolution associations, such as the Bryan Bible League, the Fundamentalists' Association, the National Anti-Evolution Society (with headquarters in St. Louis), etc. The entire membership of the Seventh Day Adventist, Lutheran, and several other denominations is strongly and actively anti-evolutionist. Much anti-evolution work is also being done

by the World's Christian Fundamentals Association, but this is largely in co-operation with the Bible Crusaders and Defenders of the Faith—probably the secret ally of the Supreme Kingdom. (The pious "Defenders" are perhaps unaware of the fact that "Defender of the Faith" was the title bestowed upon "the lecherous Henry VIII" by the Pope of Rome, and still appears upon English coins!)

THE BIBLE CRUSADERS

About a year before Bryan's death, George F. Washburn, a wealthy business man of Boston and New York, with a winter home in Clearwater, Florida, heard a sermon in a Clearwater church in which the teaching of evolution in the schools was roundly denounced. In November, 1925, he called a big mass-meeting in Clearwater, a little town on the western shore of Florida, near Tampa. On this occasion 3,000 persons heard him dedicate himself, his family, and his fortune to the war on evolution and on "the teaching of anything disrespectful to the Holy Bible." The "orthodox Bible," he declared, "must be saved from the onslaughts of Modernism," at any cost.

"The Bible Crusaders," Washburn said then, constituted a movement "destined to spread over the entire universe [*sic*] before many months have passed."

Mr. Washburn has plenty of money to launch even so cosmic an enterprise. He is head of "The Washburn Interests," which have a capitalization of two million dollars, with offices in Boston, New York and Clearwater. He is familiar to tourists as owner of four

fashionable hotels, including the Gray Moss Inn, one of the best known hotels on the west coast of Florida. He is also owner of several large apartment buildings, and other valuable holdings in middle Pinellas county.

In an issue of *The Conflict* (since merged with *The Crusader*), Rev. T. T. Martin, its editor, issued the following dithyrambs:

"When the great Bryan fell and died leading the charge, the standard was caught up by a quiet God-fearing business man of Boston, Massachusetts, and Clearwater, and to-day the Flag of Fundamentalism is borne aloft and the hearts of every Theophilus (God-lover) and every lover of religious liberty [!] are stirred as never before, and everyone is nerved for the battle that will never end till every evolutionist is driven from the tax-supported schools of America."

The Baptist Fundamentalist (Sacramento, California) of March, 1926, says:

"It seems that for some time before the death of Bryan, he and Washburn had planned the formation of the Bible Crusaders' League of America to oppose the teaching, in tax-supported schools and colleges of the states, of any theory, as a fact, that man has descended or ascended from any of the orders of the lower animals. The organization of the Bible Crusaders was delayed by the death of Bryan, but Mr. Washburn and his colleagues soon inaugurated the movement, which was attended, at Clearwater, Florida, by about 3,000 residents and visitors [the population of Clearwater, by the 1920 census, was 2,427]. A speakers' bureau was formed at once and the actual work was started. A call soon came from Mississippi, the Crusaders were ready, and forthwith the indomitable [Rev.] T. T. Martin, Rev. E. A. Bateman, Rev. C. C. Jones, J. A. Maples and I. R. Dean, Bible Crusaders, marched into that state and began the work of education and propaganda. The re-

sult, soon, was a law passed by both houses of the Legislature, and the signing of the bill by Gov. Henry L. Whitfield."

In launching the Crusaders' organization in Clearwater, Mr. Washburn stated in his address: "If this movement only stops the invasion of the Modernist, I would rather be known as the founder of it than to be president of these United States." Four months previously, at the time of the Scopes trial, he had announced by telegram, after subscribing $10,000 toward the proposed Fundamentalist "university" at Dayton:

"If you succeed in raising $1,000,000 for a Fundamentalist university [Ground was broken on November 5, 1926, for the first unit of this Bryan Memorial University], I will increase my subscription from $10,000 to $25,000 and will give $25-000 additional toward creating a $1,000,000 fund to organize the Fundamentalists of America into defenders of the faith in every state. If this battle of the ages encircles the world, *it may become necessary for the Evangelical Protestants and the Roman Catholics to unite their forces* in defense of the Apostles' Creed to resist this world-wide invasion of Atheism."

Following the passage of the anti-evolution bill in Mississippi, Washburn said:

"Our great victory in Mississippi will soon be followed by other states until this great Christian republic has been freed from the domination of Agnosticism and Atheism [meaning Modernism and evolution] in our public schools and universities."

In *The Crusaders' Champion* (recently combined with *The American Fundamentalist*, of New York, and *The Conflict*, of Blue Mountain, Mississippi, under the name of *The Crusader*), their official organ—published at Clearwater in the winter, and at Plymouth, Massa-

chusetts, in the summer,—the Bible Crusaders carried for some weeks the following full-page announcement:

We must organize the nation and Demand

That if the Bible Is To Be Ruled Out of the Tax-Supported Schools and Colleges of America, then Evolution and Every Other Form of Religion [*sic*] Must Go Too, Whether Taught Under the Guise of Science or Otherwise. Whether True or False.

We Want a National Advisory Council consisting of Statesmen, Churchmen, Educators and Business Men—the Most Prominent in America. Please Nominate One from Each State.

We Want a Vice President and Advisory Council of 100 for Each State. Name the Most prominent Citizens in Your State—Both Lay and Ministerial—Men and Women.

We Want a Chairman and Advisory Council of 100 for Each County in Each State. Likewise Name Your Choice.

We Want a Commander and a Battalion of Crusaders of 25 or more in Each Town or City in Each State who will organize at once.

Please Send Names of Organizers, Speakers and Members of Battalions to

GEORGE F. WASHBURN
Director General—Clearwater, Florida.

MEMBERSHIP

Any person of good moral character, regardless of race, sex or creed, *or no creed nor church membership*, is entitled to membership in the Bible Crusaders of America, *provided* [italics mine] such persons believe in the Deity of Christ, and the fundamental principles of the Bible, such as the Virgin birth, His Bodily Resurrection, His vicarious atonement and the Bible as the infallible and inspired word of God.

OBJECT

The mission of the Bible Crusaders of America is to combat:

Modernism, Evolution, Agnosticism and Atheism at every point.

Our special objective is to eliminate all teaching of Evolution and Agnosticism from the tax-supported Public Schools and Colleges of America.

OUR SLOGAN IS—BACK TO THE BIBLE; CHRIST AND THE CONSTITUTION.

The officers of the Bible Crusaders of America are (November, 1926): George F. Washburn, Commander; Hon. John S. Taylor, President Florida State Senate, Vice-Commander; Robert F. Hodnett, D.D., National Secretary; Hon. H. W. Bivins, National Treasurer.

The International Advisory Council of the Crusaders consists of the following: Hon. John W. Martin, Governor of Florida; Hon. Park Trammell, United States Senator from Florida; Hon. Herbert J. Drane, Member of Congress from Florida; Hon. William D. Upshaw, [ex-] Member of Congress from Georgia; Hon. T. Webber Wilson, Member of Congress from Mississippi; Hon. Miles C. Allgood, Member of Congress from Alabama; Hon. Charles G. Edwards, Member of Congress from Georgia; Hon. H. E. Rowbottom, Member of Congress from Indiana; Hon. S. R. Van Sant, ex-Governor of Minnesota; Col. R. H. Henry, Jackson, Mississippi; Col. T. J. Watkins, Clearwater, Florida; Prof. George McCready Price, the Fundamentalist (Seventh Day Adventist) "geologist," now living in England; Arthur I. Brown, M.D., C.M., F.R.C.S.E., of Vancouver, Canada; Rev. Dr. I. R. Dean, of Toronto, Canada; Rev. Dr. John Roach Straton, New York City; Rev. Dr. William Bell Riley, Minneapolis; Rev. Dr. Clarence True Wilson, Washington, D. C., former President Oregon Anti-

Saloon League, now Executive Secretary of the Methodist Board of Temperance, Prohibition and Public Morals; Albert E. Smith, D.D., Ph.D., President of Ohio Northern University (a Methodist institution); Rev. Dr. Leander S. Keyser, Springfield, Ohio, Professor of Systematic Theology, Hamma Divinity School (Lutheran); Rev. Dr. Frederic W. Farr, Los Angeles; Rev. Dr. William L. Pettingill, Dean of the Philadelphia Bible School; Rev. Dr. J. L. Campbell, Carson and Newman College (Baptist), Jefferson City, Tennessee; Rev. Dr. L. W. Munhall, editor of *The Methodist*, Philadelphia; Rev. Dr. Victor I. Masters, editor of *The Western Recorder*, Louisville; Rev. T. T. Martin, of whom more anon; Rev. Dr. Frank E. Allen, Winnipeg, Canada; Guy H. Fish, General Secretary of the Iowa Baptist Bible Union; Rev. F. W. Gracey, ex-President of the Baptist Union, Ireland; Rev. Dr. J. Lewis Smith, editor of The Baptist Fundamentalist, Sacramento, California; Rev. Dr. Mark A. Matthews, well known Fundamentalist Presbyterian minister, of Seattle; and Rev. Dr. Millard A. Jenkens, Abilene, Texas (Baptist).

While the Crusaders have enlisted the services of a number of Fundamentalist orators, Mr. Washburn places his hopes for nation-wide (or universe-wide) success on effective organization. Among their seven or more paid speakers, incidentally, is the Rev. Dr. Thomas H. Nelson, "the brilliant lawyer-evangelist of Zion City, Illinois," the consecrated town where they teach real Fundamentalism in the public schools, including the Biblical doctrine that the earth is flat, and much else of the "science" of ancient Babylon.

The Crusaders are grouped in four grand divisions:

(1) associate members, (2) active members, (3) ministers and evangelists, and (4) a children's branch, known as Junior Crusaders. There is also, as previously stated, the official magazine of the society, at first published weekly, now monthly, replete in arguments against evolution and Modernism, and containing news of the progress of the movement. The managing editor is Washburn himself, with Coleman Craig as editor. Contributing editors are Matthews, Straton, Martin, Dean, Brown, Keyser and Allen.

Dr. John Roach Straton, a member of the Advisory Council and the editorial board, told a representative of *The New York Times* that "within a year there will be a struggle in nearly every state." He declared that "the moral decline of the present day started two generations ago when the dark and sinister shadow of Darwinism fell across the fair field of human life"; and that "America's educational system ultimately will be wrecked if the teaching of evolution is allowed to continue."

Against this attempt to throttle freedom in research and teaching stand only the proponents of the scientific method (really the center of Fundamentalist attack), who realize that success of the obscurantists would lead us straight back to the Dark Ages, when scientific truth was determined by ecclesiastical councils, leading eventually to the horrors of the Inquisition.

"Here we find today," said Clarence Darrow in the Dayton courthouse, "as brazen and as bold an attempt to destroy learning as was ever made in the Middle Ages, and the only difference is that we have not provided that they [scientists] shall

be burned at the stake. But there is time for that, your honor; we have to approach these things gradually."

The seriousness of the situation is at once grasped when it is considered that this organization, hardly more than a year old, already has at its disposal hundreds of thousands of dollars. Mr. Washburn alone has already (November, 1926), donated $200,000 or more to the work in hand. Of this amount, $5,000 was sent to Tennessee to combat the efforts of the enlightened citizenry of that state (led by the Tennessee Academy of Sciences) to repeal the anti-evolution law. How much was, later on, donated to the successful campaign in Mississippi, and to the partly successful crusade in Louisiana, has not been made public.

Among the members of the "official staff" of the Bible Crusaders is Dr. William B. Riley of Minneapolis and Los Angeles, with Dr. Straton the arch-enemy of true culture to-day. Dr. Riley is also executive-secretary, and one of the four founders, of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association. On a visit to Los Angeles in December, 1925, Dr. Riley announced that every state in the union would be organized within twelve months to aid in a nation-wide campaign for a *national* law similar to the Tennessee law. He told a member of the Science League of America, a few months before this, that he had himself raised more than $600,000 to carry on the war against evolution. He stated that plans were under way for the establishment of a central Fundamentalist "university," in or near Chicago, to cost $10,000,000.

At its May, 1926, meeting, in Toronto, the World's

Christian Fundamentals Association discussed plans for the establishment of Fundamentalist colleges in every state in the United States and every province in Canada. The articles of incorporation are to be modelled after those of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and a college for post-graduate work is to be located in Chicago, and to be known as "Bryan University." It was explained that $25,000,000 would have to be raised in five years to carry out the plan. The project met with the full approbation of the delegates.

Meanwhile, during April, 1926, the Bible Crusaders sent letters to colleges and universities with the object of forming "a great national alliance for a big forward movement, *to the end that money and students and legacies will be diverted from Modernist institutions to our own.*"

Another purpose of the letter was to ascertain from each educational institution the classification it elected to adopt—whether to be listed as a Fundamentalist institution or otherwise. "It is eminently fitting," said Mr. Washburn (whose signature appears as the writer), "that each institution should indicate its own classification in the list, even though we know the position of each. This method will certainly appeal to all as fair and impartial."

The issue of *The Crusaders' Champion* for June 11, 1926, carried a "Summary of Evangelical Educational Institutions that request us to list them as Fundamentalists." Not one of the sixty-one schools, seminaries, "colleges" and "universities" listed has any standing in the world of education, so far as I can learn. At the

end of this list of Fundamentalist schools we read:

"To Patrons and Benefactors of Evangelical Denominational Colleges—If you fail to find in the above list the name of the educational institution to which you are sending your child and your money, or which you plan in legacy, we suggest that you ascertain why it is not included. You will desire to learn whether your Fundamentalist support is being given to a Modernist school."

Recently, *The Crusader* made some suggestive changes in its full-page advertisement, which are more than self-explanatory, especially the last paragraph:

HELP US ELIMINATE EVOLUTION FROM THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES IN YOUR STATE. . . .

OUR PLAN OF PROCEDURE

Our new method of procedure is to have anti-evolution bills introduced in the legislatures of every state and thereby test the sentiment in such states.

To accomplish this great task in the shortest possible time, we desire to co-operate with existing Fundamentalist organizations in each state.

We will furnish speakers and legislative experts free of charge wherever our co-operation or assistance is desired.

We have different plans of procedure, according to the varying situations in the different states. . . .

OBJECT

The Bible Crusaders of America is an independent, non-denominational organization whose special mission is to secure the elimination of the teaching of evolution and Agnosticism from the tax-supported schools and colleges of America —either by *arranging with state governments for such elimination* [!] or by legislative action in such states.

From what has been said, it will not require great effort of the imagination for any sensible person to realize that the educated liberal elements in this country have before them a real and probably protracted defensive—if not offensive—struggle. Mr. Washburn confidently asserted, in the letter to colleges quoted above, that the Fundamentalists outnumber the Modernists and evolutionists five to one. "We have," he said, "forces enough and are strong enough if united to overwhelm the enemy. . . . We must unite to win. We must stand together. We must combine."

Dr. Albert A. Dieffenbach, editor of *The Christian Register* (Unitarian), of Boston, takes a rather pessimistic view of the present situation. Speaking on October 14, 1926, before the Iowa-Nebraska Unitarian Association (meeting in Omaha), he said:

> "The men upon whom the whole country called for deliverance from such bondage as exists in Tennessee, Mississippi, Texas, Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, and Oklahoma, in which a state religion already is virtually established, have given up the fight and left the field to oncoming political forces, who are making dogma into a statute and are driving out all who preach and teach the modern view of the Bible and religion. Under such conditions America could not have come into being, and as a consequence cannot survive."

It is the task of Edward Young Clarke, who "sold" to the American public the Ku Klux Klan, to "sell" to them now the Supreme Kingdom, uniting in one group all those of Fundamentalist persuasion who also delight in secret societies; while Mr. Washburn and his Crusaders work out in the open. In moral, if not legal, co-operation they will organize another and a more "Invisible Em-

pire" than that of Mr. Clarke's—now "Dr." Evans'—Ku Klux Klan (counting five million members, a million and a half of whom are women, according to their report for October, 1926). This time we are to have, it would seem, an Invisible Theocracy. (Since this chapter was written, a very interesting article—"George F. Washburn and His Bible Crusaders"—appeared in *The Haldeman-Julius Monthly*—January, 1927—from the pen of Walter W. Liggett, who interviewed Washburn at his summer home on Massachusetts Bay, and gives us a clear personal view of "the General.")

The well known correspondent, Frank R. Kent, has clearly shown in an interesting account of his trip "from coast to coast" for the purpose of finding out what the voters are thinking about, that the anti-evolution question (or, as he puts it, "the Bible question") has become a veritable national issue, second in popular interest only to the prohibition problem. There are indications, he states, that this latest issue will, within a year or so, take precedence over every other public question in many states of the Union.

> "Few political observers," says Mr. Kent, "doubt that we are at the start of another such fight as we had [and are having] over prohibition, that here is another issue that reaches the hearts of the people and on which politicians will straddle, seekers for office trim and pose—another issue that will promote hypocrisy and deceit and encourage the fools, the frauds, and the fakers."

The Supreme Kingdom had not yet entered the political field when Mr. Kent made his report, nor had the Crusaders been formally mobilized. Since then they

have succeeded in forcing an anti-evolution law through the Mississippi Legislature, and a similar bill through the lower house of the Louisiana Legislature. It will be instructive as well as interesting to see now how the work of the Crusaders was carried through to its triumphant conclusion in Mississippi.

CHAPTER II

MISSISSIPPI'S HUMILIATION

ON February 8, 1926, the Mississippi House of Representatives passed a bill which prohibited the teaching in state-supported schools of any theory that man "ascended or descended from a low order of animals." The vote was 76 to 32. This vote climaxed three hours of eloquent debate on both sides, which members of the upper house attended in a body. In addition to prohibiting the teaching of the theory of evolution, this measure made it unlawful for any teacher, text-book commissioner, or other authority empowered to select books, to choose those that "teach a doctrine that man ascended or descended from a lower order of animals." The penalty for violation is a fine not exceeding $500 and cancellation of contract. The bill was passed by the Senate on February 24th, by a vote of 29 to 16, although it had been unfavorably reported by the House Committee on Education to which it was originally referred. This bill was immediately signed by Gov. Henry L. Whitfield, and became a law of the state on March 11th.

To all intents and purposes, says the editor of *The Jackson Daily Clarion*, the bill was dead "until the arrival in Jackson of representatives of the Bible Crusaders of America. These workers revived the measure,

blew the breath of life into it, and succeeded in having it passed by the lower house and sent to the Senate."

The fight in the House was conducted by the Rev. T. T. Martin, of Blue Mountain, Mississippi, and Memphis, Tennessee, a member of the official staff of the Bible Crusaders, and author of "Hell and the High Schools," exploited by him at Dayton during the Scopes trial. Given the floor for a talk in favor of the anti-evolution bill, he represented the theory of evolution as a doctrine essentially antagonistic to Fundamentalist—or, as he put it, "Christian" doctrine. To quote a few typical passages from his address (some of which was "lifted" bodily from Bryan's "In His Image"):

"Quietly and unnoticed the enemies of the Bible have been substituting irreligion for religion. Having excluded the teaching of religion, they are daily teaching that which cannot be true if the Bible is true. They do not always attack the Bible, but that which they teach is built upon the theory that the Bible is untrue. Many of these teachers are Atheists, and do not believe in either a personal God or a personal immortality, as Professor Leuba of Bryn Mawr shows in his book 'Belief in God and Immortality.'

"The so-called theistic evolutionists refuse to admit that they are Atheists, contending that they believe in a God back of creation; they argue that evolution is God's method, but they put God so far away as to practically destroy a sense of God's presence in the daily life and a sense of responsibility to Him. At least, that is the tendency, and since the so-called theistic evolutionists borrow all their facts from atheistic evolutionists and differ from them only in the origin of life, theistic evolution may be described as an anaesthetic administered to young Christians to deaden the pain while their religion is being removed by materialists.

"When the Christians of this nation understand the demoralizing influence of this godless doctrine, they will refuse to allow it to be taught at public expense."

The sort of stuff that turned the tide against the "Atheists" may be gleaned from the follow sample:

"It is claimed that the law will bring on Mississippi the ridicule and abuse from the North that have been heaped upon Tennessee. Reply: Shall the legislature of Mississippi barter the faith of the children of Mississippi in God's word and in the Savior for the fulsome praise of a paganized press? Go back to your homes and face your constituents and tell them that you bartered the faith of your children for gold; go back to the fathers and mothers of Mississippi and tell them that because you could not face the ridicule and scorn and abuse of Bolshevists and Anarchists and Atheists and Agnostics and their co-workers, you turned their children over to a teaching that God's word is a tissue of lies and that the Savior who said it was God's word was only the illegitimate son of a Jewish fallen woman."

It is quite certain that a majority of the legislators understood that this maudlin appeal had nothing whatever to do with the validity of the theory of evolution, or with the question of the right of the State to enact restrictive laws at the behest of religious zealots of Fundamentalist persuasion. But they feared "the folks back home," and passed the bill in the House with a majority of forty-four votes, and in the Senate with a majority of thirteen: i. e., of 154 votes in the two chambers, 105 were for suppression of freedom of teaching.

A powerful speech was made against the passage of this reactionary measure by the Hon. E. K. Windham, of Prentiss county.

"It was my hope, Mr. Speaker," he said, "when this bill was adversely reported by the Committee on Education, that the advocates of this measure would accept that verdict and not force the issue on the floor of the House. I had hoped, then, that the members of this body would not be forced to sacrifice their honest convictions upon the altar of so-called public opinion. I knew then, as I know now, that a majority of the members of the House are conscientiously opposed to the passage of the bill. But I also knew that, when forced to cast a record vote on this measure, conscience would give way to public opinion; and that 'the next election' would be a more powerful force than 'the next generation.' In saying this, I do not mean to cast any reflection upon the integrity of the members of this House: I simply speak what I know to be true."

While the better educated public of Mississippi deprecated the passage of the anti-evolution law, they were not sufficiently organized to unite their forces and send representatives to Jackson to hearten the progressive legislators. The Fundamentalists, on the other hand, were represented by no fewer than six aggressive lobbyists, backed by the Washburn fortune. At least one of the Defenders of the Faith did not hesitate to violate the laws of the state in his zeal, as witness Mr. Windham's indictment:

"Before I close I want to call the attention of this House to Chapter 105 of the law of 1916, which makes it unlawful for any person to lobby here without first registering as such and paying a fee for same. For the last ten days, we have witnessed the activities of one of the most pernicious lobbyists who ever paced the aisles of this Chamber. He is the representative of the Crusaders. He has daily violated the laws of this state. If he is such an ardent supporter of law-enforcement, let him turn himself over to the proper authorities and accept the

penalty prescribed by statute—three years in the state penitentiary. If he will do this, at the end of three years he may still doubt the theory of evolution; but I'll guarantee that the gentleman will have more respect for the liberties of men than he has to-day."

The subject of this attack, T. T. Martin (who, needless to say, did not accept Mr. Windham's invitation), was formerly a teacher of "natural sciences" in a Fundamentalist "female college" in Texas. He is not, so far as I can learn from "Who's Who in America" or elsewhere, entitled to the "D.D." with which the Crusaders have endowed him. This pious Bible Crusader and Defender of the Faith, as recently as March, 1925 (after he had published a number of books against evolution), was willing, for a chance at fifty dollars, to introduce "Hell" in the high schools. Under a pseudonym, and with a false address, he submitted an essay in a prize contest conducted by the Science League of America, the subject (in accordance with the terms made by the donor, William Floyd of New York City) being "Why Evolution Should Be Taught in Our Schools Instead of the Book of Genesis." The highest prize was $50. Unfortunately, Mr. Martin signed his pseudonym in his own handwriting, and later sent a letter in the same hand acknowledging that he was the fictitious "J. J. Boyer."

The eloquent and sincere Crusader's plea for the teaching of evolution ("Hell") in the high schools rather than the account given in Genesis may be of some interest to his followers and others, and is here submitted:

"The Jesus of Christianity, its great leader and teacher, the world's greatest thinker in the sphere of religion, discarded

tradition and followed after truth. 'It hath been said by them of old—but I say unto you.' Had he not shattered the shackles of tradition and followed after truth he would have lived and died a Palestinian peasant.

"Tradition is the handicap of civilization, of Education. Contrast inquiring, investigating, observing Japan with tradition-bound China.

"From the cradle the child learns by investigation, by inquiry, until tradition is clamped upon the mind, and he is not allowed to think and draw conclusions.

"Education is to train the mind to think accurately, quickly, deeply, broadly, continuously. The mind needs to be 'fertilized by the dews and rains of thought.'

"Education by coercion must go; Education by dogmatism is doomed. We must have Education by investigation, by inquiry, by observation. Tradition fetters the mind and prevents inquiry and investigation and hinders thinking. Why should physics and chemistry be taught by experiment, and history, sociology and psychology by observation, but religion by tradition? Why should the traditions of religion prevent students from the study of geology by observation? Not imposition by authority but open-minded inquiry must be the guiding star of our Educational system.

"Why should the traditions of religion be fastened on science and be made the traditions of science?

"Progress comes from thinking; thinking comes from inquiry, investigation, observation. But tradition puts the clamp on the mind and prevents thinking, hinders progress. What progress has ever come from tradition? What Education, what thinking, what progress can come to the mind of the student by crowding it into a corner and forcing it to believe that grass and trees were in existence and grew before there was any sunlight? What Education, what thinking, what progress can come to the mind of the student by forcing him to believe that the earth and all things on it were created in six twenty-four hour days, when he sees before him the strata of rock in any mountain side, laid down by sediment from water through ages of time?

"The nations most bound by tradition have made the least progress; the religions most bound by tradition have produced the fewest great men, have made the least advancement.

"Whatever good there is in Christianity comes from Jesus, this leader and teacher shattering the shackles of tradition. He invariably accepted the best explanation of facts, irrespective of tradition. Shall we train our students to do less? If, then, Evolution is the best explanation of the facts as to the existence of the earth, and the scholarship of the world is agreed as to this, then let Evolution be taught in the schools, in the place of the book of Genesis."

Publication in parallel columns of this essay and Mr. Martin's speech in Mississippi would make excellent thought-provoking material for the consideration of his co-workers and admirers in the war on modern science.

Following this earnest Fundamentalist's glorious victory for sectarian religion in the Mississippi lower house, the superintendent of the high school of Meridian, assisted by a group of seniors, made a public bonfire to destroy all pages from their text-books (including pages from works on sociology) in which reference was made to the theory of evolution. This work of destruction, not having been authorized by law, might well have been followed by the arrest of all those who took part in it, on the ground of wilful destruction of State property. But of course no such action was taken.

The Senate battle was under direction of Crusaders Dr. I. R. Dean and Dr. L. C. Moroney, assisted by Drs. Bateman, Jones and Maples. (Nearly all Fundamentalist "leaders" are Doctors of Divinity, but the degrees are seldom earned at colleges of standing in academic circles.) State Senator B. M. Russell sent a telegram to the Bible Crusaders' headquarters in Clearwater, in

which he gave credit for "reviving the Evolution Bill" to "the staff of the Bible Crusaders." "The arguments of these gentlemen," he said, "were forceful and convincing, and went a far way in changing the sentiment for the bill."

Among others who took a leading part in the passage of the anti-evolution bill were Lieut. Gov. Dennis Murphree, of Jackson, who presided over the Senate; T. L. Bailey, Speaker of the House during the debate; and W. F. Bond, State Superintendent of Public Instruction. *The Crusaders' Champion* published photographs of these three worthies, under Superintendent Bond's picture the following being printed:

> "Gruenberg's Elementary Biology is an adopted book for the state agricultural high schools. He [Bond] caused the false teaching to be deleted from the books even without specific law to support him."

In the Senate, as in the House, three hours of fervid debate preceded the vote. All efforts to amend the bill failed. (Some amendments offered were satrical—for example, the one proposing to make the penalty burning at the stake, "since Mississippi is about to revive the Spanish Inquisition.") So interested were the Representatives that they in turn left their chamber to hear the Senators speak. Senator Belle Kearney, the only woman state senator in the South, spoke in favor of the passage of the anti-evolution bill, explaining that while she had formerly opposed it, she had changed her mind (or her constituents had changed it for her; in a private letter she proclaimed her deep interest in evolution, and at

the same time pointed with pride to the fact that this was her second term in the Senate).

As Mr. Windham remarked in his forceful speech in the lower house:

> "As Bill Nye would say, the advocates of this bill want a law that will permit them to preach and practise any doctrine they desire, and one that will guarantee to them that no one else can do the same."

The Deer Creek Pilot, of Sharkey county, proudly announced to the people of Mississippi that "we believe we have for use in our agricultural high schools next year the only text-book on biology that does not mention the subject of evolution." This will lend point to a letter written to the Science League of America by a prominent educator and author of biology text-books, who wrote nearly two years ago, "I find that the publishers have been effectively intimidated by the Fundamentalist agitation, for they are all insisting upon high school text-books with evolution left out."

On March 12, 1926, *The Mississippian* published a letter written by Dr. Alfred Hume, Chancellor of the University of Mississippi, to Governor Whitfield, urging him to veto the anti-evolution bill. In this letter Dr. Hume pointed out—among other objections to the bill—that if the measure should be allowed to stand as the law of the state, a number of the faculty of the state university would be confronted with "a cruel dilemma. Either they will have to evade, disregard, or openly violate the law, or else they will have to be guilty of intellectual dishonesty. To anyone at all worthy of his

position on our faculty both of these courses are unthinkable and intolerable." Dr. Hume emphasized the fact that "where men are not free to think and learn there is stagnation and death." No university can fulfill its mission to its students when shackled intellectually.

So far, so good. But Chancellor Hume seems somewhat to have lost track of this principle in other parts of his plea for academic freedom. "It goes without saying," he stated, "that anything tending toward atheistic teaching [i. e., any facts presented by a teacher tending toward Atheism or Agnosticism] would never be tolerated" by the Chancellor of the state university—legally a purely secular institution. Any findings of science, in short, may be freely taught—so long as the facts discovered do not conflict with the Bible, which, says Dr. Hume, "I believe [to be] fundamental in our civilization." The University of Mississippi, he assures the governor, "is essentially a Christian institution, . . . shot through and through with the teachings of our Lord."

Dr. John M. Mecklin, a native of Mississippi, but now Professor of Sociology in Dartmouth College, hearing of the passage of the anti-evolution bill in the House of Representatives, wrote a strong letter of protest to the President of the Senate, some paragraphs of which apply with full force to such anti-social legislation anywhere and everywhere in this Republic. To quote the paragraphs in point:

"Such a law would violate the spirit if not the letter of the Constitution of the United States, which says, 'Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or pro-

hibiting the free exercise thereof.' This proposed law amounts to the recognition of certain religious views, opposed to evolution and popularly known as Fundamentalism, as the established religion of the State of Mississippi, thus discriminating against Mississippians who make evolution a constituent part of their religious beliefs. To do this is to flout the spirit and intent of the Constitution of the United States and to violate the principle of religious freedom so precious to our forefathers. Can the gentlemen of the Senate of Mississippi contemplate for a moment the passage of a law so monstrously unjust and un-American?

". . . Finally, may I add a word on behalf of the thousands of boys and girls in your public schools? It is their intellectual birthright to know the truth on these matters. Granting for the sake of argument that evolution is a theory, seemingly incompatible with certain religious beliefs, this principle of science is taught in the schools of every civilized nation on the earth to-day. To know the doctrines of Darwin is a part of a liberal education; for evolution is an integral part of our modern culture. Are you going to deny these boys and girls their right at least to have this great principle of science explained to them? The Southland, thanks to a great war and the presence of millions of an undeveloped and alien race, has had a long struggle to provide its people with the means of popular education. To-day the South is fast growing rich and is building schools and colleges that rival the best. Can it afford to pass laws that handicap its teachers in their work and close the door upon the inquiring minds of its youth in their search for the truth?"

Obviously, students of Fundamentalist-ridden universities who desire to take up graduate work in any of the larger institutions of the northern states will be placed at a great disadvantage when offering credentials from schools in which evolution is an outlawed subject. And what answer will the professors of embryology and anatomy make to questions as to the significance of

various temporary foetal structures or permanent vestigial structures and organs in the human body? In many ways, the teacher of anthropology, of physiology, or even of sociology, will be severely handicapped in his work where the law of the State makes recourse to the theory of evolution a criminal offense against the State religion.

Meanwhile, as was only too truly remarked by William Morris Houghton:

> "The Fundamentalists have been marching steadily toward their goal, which is a national legislative strait-jacket for thought and education. Of all the challenges to leadership on the part of the men who head our institutions of learning this creeping mediaevalism, it seems to us, is easily the greatest since the Civil War."

CHAPTER III

LOUISIANA'S NARROW ESCAPE

THE Bible Crusaders have recently concluded—for the time being—an intensive anti-evolution campaign in Louisiana; and the indications are that their efforts will eventually be crowned with complete success, despite the fact that their anti-evolution bill of 1926 failed of passage in the Senate. The Louisiana correspondent for *The Baptist Standard,* of Texas, referring to the failure of the Senate of Louisiana to pass the anti-evolution bill, said, "The day of reckoning will come on soon. Only two years until there will be a new set from governor on down in the capitol."

On October 11, 1926, incidentally, Gov. Harry L. Fuqua was called by death, after an illness of only a few days. Oramel H. Simpson, of New Orleans, as Lieutenant Governor, was immediately sworn in as the state's chief executive.

The bill to prohibit the teaching of evolutionary theories in public schools, normal schools, colleges and universities, supported in whole or in part by public school funds, was introduced in the Louisiana Legislature on May 11, 1926. The bill was passed by the House of Representatives on June 22nd by a large majority, but on June 23rd the measure was quietly shelved—i. e.,

"indefinitely postponed"—by the Senate. This proposed law is House Bill No. 278, and reads as follows:

"An Act to prohibit the teaching that mankind either descended or ascended from a lower order of animals and the adoption or use of text-books which teach that mankind either descended or ascended from a lower order of animals, in all the schools, colleges, normals, institutes and universities supported in whole or in part by the Public Education funds of the State of Louisiana, to declare violations of this Act to be a misdemeanor and to provide penalties for the violations of the provisions thereof.

"Section 1. Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, that it shall be unlawful for any teacher or instructor in any school, college, normal, institute or university supported in whole or in part by the Public Education funds of the State of Louisiana to teach that mankind either descended or ascended from a lower order of animals.

"Section 2. No teacher, instructor or text-book committee shall adopt or use any text-book which teaches that mankind either descended or ascended from a lower order of animals in any school described in Section 1 of this Act.

"Section 3. Any teacher, instructor or text-book committee found guilty of the violation of any of the provisions of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be fined not less than Fifty Dollars nor more than Two Hundred Dollars.

"Section 4. The provisions of Section 2 of this Act shall become effective at the expiration of any contract or contracts now binding upon the Education Board of the State of Louisiana.

"Section 5. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with or in conflict with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed."

The Louisiana anti-evolution bill was sponsored locally by the Baptists, but the real fighting force was a committee of Mr. Washburn's Crusaders from Clear-

water, Florida. As in the Mississippi case, the bill was introduced by "an unlettered countryman" (from Union parish), and had "languished in committee," though it had been favorably reported by the House Education Committee by a vote of eleven to one. Then arrived the Defenders of the Faith, flags flying. But before going further into the story it should be mentioned that the bill which was passed by the House—quoted above—was not the one originally prepared. The first bill made the tactical error of basing its claims upon the Creation story, or stories, told in Genesis. Later it was decided not to mention the Bible at all, or even the word "evolution." At this point we must depend for further details upon Bruce Phillips (*Haldeman-Julius Monthly*, pages 79–80, October, 1926):

"This bill went to committee where it, too, languished for some time. Finally the Bible Crusaders became a bit restless and, with the aid of a local Baptist minister, managed to smoke it out and secure action upon it. The Committee on Public Education reported it favorably. A high school principal was the one man to vote against a favorable report.

"Coming to the floor of the House at an opportune time for vote-trading, a vital school matter was also ready for action and its proponents were sorely in need of votes to secure its passage. The bill passed the House with a vote to spare. It requires fifty-one votes to pass a measure in the Louisiana House and the anti-evolution bill went over by a vote of fifty-two to forty-three. . . .

"It was sent to the upper house the following morning, and before the Senate was actually down to business, being engaged in taking up the routine of sending House bills to committee, the parliamentarians who opposed the bill had neatly shelved it by indefinitely postponing it under the very noses of its advocates. . . .

"Taking no chances, the Senate, on the following day, postponed a second bill dealing with religion, which the House had passed without objection. The measure was well camouflaged, but it met with little consideration when it went to the upper house."

The leader of the Crusaders, much chagrined, declared that, as a result of "this neat bit of parliamentary procedure," "new faces would be seen in the next Legislature."

From *The Crusaders' Champion* of July 16th, we learn, from the Rev. L. G. Moroney, of Baton Rouge, that the sentiment was so strong in the House against any attempt at drastic opposition measures that the bill passed to engrossment on third reading without a dissenting vote. When the bill came to final vote in the House, it passed, as said, 52 to 43. Although the Senate killed the bill by a parliamentary trick, the opponents in that body had but a majority of two, "the vote standing on the Shattuck [anti-evolution] bill 15 to 17."

From the same authoritative source we glean the following additional facts:

"The first bill introduced in the House dealing with evolution was offered by Mr. Hudson, of Union parish. It was a very strong measure, prohibiting only such things as in other states had been prohibited by laws which have stood the tests of the courts. After considerable discussion, the author of the bill and a number of friends of such legislation concluded that a law patterned after the one in Mississippi would have a better chance in the Louisiana Legislature than the one proposed by Mr. Hudson. The conclusion was definitely reached that a bill should be offered which would in its nature include all of the provisions of the Hudson bill, but include them by inference in one statement, namely that it should be unlawful to teach

in tax-supported schools 'that mankind either descended or ascended from a lower form of animal life.' Mr. Hudson lent himself in a noble and large-hearted way to these plans, and contended loyally for the enactment of the Shattuck bill. Mr. S. O. Shattuck of Calcasieu parish, a long-time and highly honored member of the House, agreed to write and foster the bill which took his name ["the Shattuck bill"] and became House Bill No. 279."

It would seem worth while to follow the Rev. Mr. Moroney's interesting story further, since it throws a clear light on Fundamentalist methods in the threatened South. I am giving it at some length, since it constitutes an historical document of the first importance, and since its references to President Thomas D. Boyd of the University of Louisiana show the peculiarly perverted attitude of the Fundamentalist mind.

"For a correct understanding of what will be written later in this story, it is necessary here to inform our readers with respect to two other bills that were introduced, and which in a general way touched upon our issue. The first was a bill by Col. Sambola Jones which proposed to prohibit the employment of any Atheist in any capacity in the public schools and forbid the use of school property by Atheists for lectures or any other purpose. [Remember that to the Fundamentalist all evolutionists are "Atheists."] It was the belief of Mr. Jones, as stated before the House Education Committee, that his bill would prevent the very thing which we desired to have prevented.

"The second was a bill by Representative Holloman, which recited the constitutional guarantees of religious liberty, and added a prohibition against the teaching in public schools of any doctrine which subverted the faith of any pupil. It was the common belief among many House members that this bill was introduced for the purpose of furnishing a 'getting-off place' for such members as were unfavorable

to any anti-evolution legislation, but who could support a 'toothless' bill and use it as an alibi among their constituents.

"In the hearing before the House Committee on Education the friends of the Shattuck Bill entered no arguments. We had agreed among ourselves to send our case to the committee without argument, as we were confident that we knew the sentiments of a large majority of its membership. Colonel Jones' Bill was argued by its author, but the Holloman Bill was not discussed, owing to the fact that Mr. Holloman was not present. Mr. Hudson requested the committee to return his Bill to the House without action, explaining that he would ask the House to permit him to withdraw it from its files, and that he would support the Shattuck Bill. This left just the Jones and the Shattuck Bills to be argued. Mr. Shattuck merely stated the nature and provisions of his Bill; in arguing his own Bill, Colonel Jones spoke favorably of the Shattuck Bill and declared his intention of supporting it in case his own was defeated.

"It was in this hearing that Colonel Boyd, President of Louisiana State University, made a pitiable spectacle of himself as he argued against this legislation. Those who were present and heard him were glad to hear him say that he was speaking to the subject before the Committee; had he failed to make this statement, no one present would have known what he was talking about. No man could go farther afield from his subject than did he. He made the direct statement that science could not be taught unless such teaching included that mankind has 'descended or ascended' from a lower form of animal life. For thirty years Louisiana taxpayers have furnished bread and butter to this old man, and now at the end of his career, in feeble and precarious health, he dishonored his State and prostituted his office of trust by pleading with the committee to permit the teaching of a dogma which degraded the youth of Germany, and will corrupt the youth of America. In closing the debate Colonel Jones spoke so caustically to President Boyd concerning his unreasonable attitude that Colonel Boyd took refuge in the outside corridors."

Mr. Moroney then outlined the manner in which the bill was "indefinitely postponed" by the Senate, as just explained, and went on to say:

"The friends of the Bill expressed themselves as being amazed that a body of men trusted by the people of the great State to represent them in the Senate would engage in a parliamentary trick which was equivalent to a slap in the face for the hundreds of thousands of worthy citizens who hoped for better treatment for a measure upon which their hearts were set. . . . As the matter now stands there is a sentiment of the deepest resentment towards the Senators who were afraid to allow this measure to have decent treatment.

"A few minutes after the slaughter of the Shattuck Bill in the Senate, the House passed by a large majority the Holloman Bill, previously referred to. Our forces decided to use this bill by amending it with the provisions of the Shattuck Bill. This would have been possible, because Mr. Holloman had voted for the Shattuck Bill in the House, and such an amendment would not have changed the essential character of the bill. It would merely have put 'teeth' in it. Such an amendment could have been made by the Senate Education Committee. However, this Bill met the same fate as befell the Shattuck Bill. It was indefinitely postponed.

"The next move which our forces could make was to attack the Appropriation Bill. Two thirds majority is required in the House to pass an appropriation measure. It was proposed that we try to amend the Appropriation Bill with a provision that 'none of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay teachers who teach or who use text-books which teach that mankind has either descended or ascended from a lower form of animal life.' It is doubtful whether we could have controlled enough votes to pass the amendment, but we knew that more than one third of the members would solidly oppose the Appropriation Bill and prevent its passage unless the amendment were adopted. As our fight had been directed to the end of helping and assisting the school system [!], we wanted

to avoid, if possible, this attack upon the Appropriation Bill which would, had it been successful, have tied up the educational work of the State. This we preferred not to do if any other way could be found to secure relief. Three of us made an appointment with the State Superintendent, Mr. Harris, and laid the matter before him. This seemed a reasonable thing to do, as he had already expressed to the writer that it was his opinion that the theory of evolution should not be presented at all in high school texts. The result of our interview with him was . . . [that] what we have come to know as the Florida and Texas plan has now become the Louisiana plan also. That is the elimination of this offensive teaching from public school texts by the action of the school officials.

"The determination of the people of this State to secure the desired legislation has been strengthened and encouraged by the action of Mr. Harris, and they say that they will see to it that in the next session of the Legislature a law is enacted which will endorse and sustain his position.

"Without preliminary organization, without the Christian conscience of the State being aroused, without early agreement as to the wording of the Bill, and in the face of a bitter, hostile attitude on the part of the metropolitan press, and the persistent misrepresentation by the faculty of the Louisiana State University, and in spite of the insistent lobbying of the student body of that university, and with the influence of several of the leading clergy of the capital city against us, we had a victory. The people of Louisiana are happy and encouraged over the result."

The preliminary campaign for the passage of the anti-evolution act in the lower house at Baton Rouge was very thorough (despite Mr. Moroney's claim), and included the presentation of a rather remarkable "memorial" to the State Board of Education, the following excerpts from which may be of interest:

"Some three years ago this Convention [of Louisiana Baptists] appointed a committee to look into the matter of evolution in the text-books used in the schools of the State. . . . We are convinced that it [evolution] is being taught in many of the text-books used. We are happy to report, however, that many of the teachers of science in our schools do not endorse the evolutionary hypothesis, and are so handling it as to avoid the acceptance of it by any of their pupils. For this we heartily commend them, and earnestly urge the constituency of this Convention to use their best influence for the employment of such teachers as will thus safeguard all their pupils from this evil. . . .

"The suppression of the teaching of the theory or hypothesis of evolution in the tax-supported schools of the State is not in any fair interpretation of that term an abridgment of the so-called 'academic freedom' of either the teacher or pupil in these schools, nor is it a suppression of 'free speech'. It is only a just protest against the effort to foist upon the immature minds of the children and youth of our State the evolutionary theory of the origin of man, as a fact, when the most that can be said for such a theory is that it is an unproven hypothesis or guess ["Hypothesis" and "guess" are synonymous in the Fundamental lexicon]. . . .

"The immature minds of the pupils are being prejudiced against the truthfulness of the Bible by the text-books and teachers of this evolutionary hypothesis. The teaching of the evolutionary theory of the origin and ultimate end of man does not create in the minds of our youths any laudable pride of ancestry, nor hold before their growing ambitions a worthy ideal or inspiring hope of future greatness or of ultimate felicity beyond this life. . . .

"We are speaking for a constituency, white and black, of something more than 7,000,000; and since the Bible has been, by the courts, ruled out of the tax-supported schools of the State, we feel it is only fair that the theory of evolutionary origin of man be also ruled out, or suppressed, by such methods as may be within the province of the State Board of Education.

"Nothing said or implied in the foregoing shall be interpreted as indicating that this Commission, or the great Baptist Convention, and the greater Baptist constituency in this State, is opposed to the teaching of true science in our public schools. We gladly welcome any and all scientific facts as being entirely in accord with the whole body of Christian teaching, as that teaching is set forth in the Holy Scriptures. We are only seeking the elimination from the text-books, the curriculum, and the class-rooms of all tax-supported schools and institutions of the State, the teaching of the theory of the evolutionary origin of man."

In this "memorial" we have a perfectly clear proof that the attitude of Fundamentalists everywhere is that certain Hebrew writings shall be substituted, in effect, for the findings of modern science. It is stated explicitly that it is the object of the Fundamentalists to prohibit, by aid of the police powers of the state, the teaching of any facts or theories that they consider antagonistic to the myths of creation handed down by the ancient Hebrews as sacred literature (though not so considered by them until long after the return from Babylon). These creation stories, say the Fundamentalists, must be accepted and endorsed by the State in preference to the stories recorded in the rocks, in the structure of all plants and animals; and whatever does not agree with the Biblical account is not "true science." In so doing they seek not only to convert the educational institutions of the state and nation into theological seminaries, but also to place them under the domination of a particular and separate group of religionists—a group in disagreement not only with other religious groups, but even with the better educated members of its own denominations!

Despite the adverse action of the Senate, the teaching

of evolution in the tax-supported schools of Louisiana is already virtually abolished, as in Texas and in Florida. Mr. Moroney gives the practical results of his "interview" with Superintendent Harris:

"The State Superintendent of Education last week issued a ruling from his department to all parish superintendents [it must be remembered that Louisiana has "parishes" instead of counties] in the State instructing them that the objectionable features of Hunter's Civic Biology, the adopted high school text in this State, were to be omitted by all teachers presenting the subject in high schools. He has also announced that he has begun negotiations with the American Book Company, publishers of this text, for the purpose of securing a revision in the nature of a deletion from the text of all the material which teaches the dogma which the Shattuck Bill proposed to prohibit."

The "memorial" previously quoted was drawn up by the President of the Baptist State Convention, L. W. Sloan. In reply, the State Superintendent of Education said (as published in *The Crusaders' Champion* of August 6, 1926):

"Referring to your communication addressed to the State Board of Education, I beg to say that I have taken up with the publishers of 'A Civic Biology,' by George W. Hunter, the question of eliminating from that text, pages 191, beginning with 'Mammals,' 192, 193, 194, 195 and 196.

"I have also addressed a letter to the parish superintendents, requesting them to instruct their science teachers in charge of the Civic Biology instruction to omit the pages listed above.

T. H. Harris, State Superintendent of Education."

Yet in February, 1927, Mr. Harris denied that he was opposed to the teaching of evolution.

These are the same zealots who tell us that the *legislature*—as representing "the will of the people"—should determine whether or not the theory of evolution should be taught in the State's public schools and tax-supported colleges!

Already, on March 25, 1926, six weeks before the introduction of the anti-evolution bill, the authorities of the Louisiana State University had refused to give a course on evolution, although it was asked for by many of the students.

At Tulane University a course on "Evolution and Heredity" is still being offered, including "discussion of the theories of evolution, the facts of heredity, Mendelian inheritance and the bearing of heredity on social problems."

CHAPTER IV

NORTH CAROLINA: THE "PIVOTAL STATE"

ORTH CAROLINA has up to this writing been able to resist—legally—the encroachments of those atavists who would force the Legislature to enact a law making illegal any teaching concerning the origin of the earth and of man in advance of the views of the Babylonians, Chaldeans, and ancient Persians. It is, however, regarded by the Fundamentalists as the next logical point of attack.

The misleading anti-evolution propaganda of Bryan in the Southland was reinforced during 1922 by a visit from the voluble W. B. Riley. Early in June of that year, Dr. Z. P. Metcalf, of the science faculty of North Carolina State College, at Raleigh, engaged in a debate with the Minneapolis pastor, which took place in the assembly hall of the college. Here Dr. Riley had college students for an audience, instead of speaking in a church building packed with Fundamentalists, where he gains his boasted victories, or "decisions." The press reports state that "Dr. Metcalf stated the facts, and Dr. Riley dodged or ridiculed them"—his usual resort. "The problem in debate was whether evolution is supported by facts. The minister said that the theory had not a fact to its credit"—parroting Bryan's imbecile assertion. "Yet all of Dr. Metcalf's propositions are

facts, established by observation," concluded the press report.

But to the Fundamentalist facts *observed* or *discovered* have no standing as against "truths" anciently *revealed.*

"The line of separation between religion and science," says Dr. David Starr Jordan (quoted by Sprading, "Science versus Dogma," page 138), "is that all things in religion are assumed true because some people at some time said they were true. That is not knowledge and not science."

Not being able to induce the General Assembly of North Carolina to violate the principles of genuine Americanism by passing laws obstructive to the dissemination of scientific knowledge in the state's educational institutions, the Fundamentalist Governor, Cameron Morrison, on January 23, 1924, got together his hand-picked State Board of Education and struck from the list of high school text-books two well-known works on elementary biology, declaring that they taught the false doctrine that man is descended from a lower order of animals,—when, according to the "true" doctrine, man is descended from mud and the first woman from a bone.

"Evolution," said the learned Governor Morrison, as reported by the press, "means progress, but does not mean that man, God's highest creation, is descended from a monkey or any other animal. I do not believe he is, and *I will not consent* [italics mine] that any such doctrine shall be taught in our public schools." Teachers in the high schools are to teach what the governor believes, not what the world's scientists have

found out by hard study and thought on the subject.

As a matter of fact, no text-book on biology is now permitted in North Carolina high schools which "in any way intimates an origin of the human race other than that contained in the Bible."

The action of the evangelical governor was celebrated in the following manner, revealing the close relation of Church and State at that time in North Carolina:

> "The ball room of the governor's mansion was the scene of a prayer service, . . . when more than a hundred people, mostly state officials and employés and their wives, attended services conducted by the Rev. M. F. Ham. The evangelist highly praised Governor Morrison for the character of his administration, mentioning specifically the action of the executive in throwing out books on evolution from the accredited list of school books."

According to all reports, the Rev. Mr. Ham's close connection with the state government did not extend as far as it might—or should—toward the tax collector's office. It was stated that while the evangelist had "done a profitable business in North Carolina, he declined to pay the amount of income tax imposed by the state 'on sums of money collected by him as the fruits of various evangelistic campaigns' " (*The Truth Seeker*, page 645, October 10, 1925). Perhaps he considered that the state owed him an equivalent sum for his work in stirring up mob antagonism to the teaching of evolution in the schools.

In February, 1925, of the 111 members of the House of the General Assembly of North Carolina, 47 voted for abolishment of the right of teachers to utilize the theory of evolution in their class-rooms. The following

resolution was introduced by Representative D. Scott Poole:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, that it is the sense of the General Assembly of North Carolina that it is injurious to the welfare of the people of North Carolina for any official or teacher paid wholly or in part by taxation to teach or permit to be taught as a fact either Darwinism or any other evolutionary hypothesis that links man in blood relationship with any lower form of life."

The failure of the Poole Resolution was attributed by T. T. Martin (in *The Conflict*) to the powerful influence of Wake Forest College. He assured his readers that:

"Leaders of North Carolina Baptists will live to rue the day that because Wake Forest had inherited a million six hundred thousand dollars and had gotten hundreds of thousands from the seventy-five million campaign, they popped their fingers in the face of the Southern Baptist Convention and over the protests of North Carolina Baptists, kept the Poteats, father and son, with their Evolution, in Wake Forest, and helped so powerfully to foist the theory upon the tax-supported schools of North Carolina."

A somewhat different view of the situation was given by Nell Battle Lewis (a Smith College graduate who contributes a weekly column to *The Raleigh News and Observer*) in her very interesting article, "North Carolina" (*The American Mercury*, May, 1926). The defeat of the Poole Resolution was attributed by Miss Lewis largely to a powerful speech by an alumnus of the state university. Because of the intimate touch given the fight

on this occasion, revealing just what happened in more or less detail, it may be well to quote verbatim:

"Not since the Act of Secession was passed in 1861 had such a crowd stormed up the steps of the Capitol. It packed the galleries of the House of Representatives and boiled over into the lobbies and aisles. . . . A spare, tight-lipped country editor had come to Raleigh to represent his county for one high purpose alone. He had come to save the youth of the state from hell. Oppressed by the magnitude of that mission, he paced solemnly around the legislative chamber. Occasionally he conferred gravely with a gentleman whose demeanor suggested the ministerial. . . . The two were the author of the 1925 bill discouraging the teaching of evolution in state-controlled schools and colleges, and the anti-evolution floor leader in the House. Over in a far corner of the chamber a large alumnus of the state university . . . looked wearily at the crusaders, and laughed. Members of the anti-evolution cohorts came to the leaders for last minute commands. About them all was a striking similarity of facial expression, a certain tightness and grimness of mouth, a zealous and fiery gleam of the eye, what, for want of a better term, might be called the Bryan look. . . .

"It was a tense, belligerent mob. . . . The limping Confedate veteran who for years has acted as sergeant-at-arms for the House was powerless to clear the aisles of spectators. The Speaker slammed down his gavel and declared that because of the disorder of the crowd debate was impossible without a riot ensuing, and the House was adjourned.

"The crowd, a little smaller and somewhat less obstinate, reassembled the next morning, and the debate, so called, got under way. For hours it dragged on, with the anti-evolutionists doing most of the talking. They condemned a brand of evolutionary science unrecognizable by any scientist present. They called upon the Lord to bless their heroic labors, and sat down, glowing with holy zeal, but temporarily winded.

"The large alumnus of the university rose, briefly reviewed the unsuccessful attempts to suppress freedom of thought in the past, resented on behalf of his institution the current attempt in North Carolina, warmed to his subject, put the anti-evolutionists on the spit, and closed with considerable eloquence. Plainly disconcerted, the author of the bill shambled down in front of the Speaker's desk. He had had no idea, he explained, that his opponents felt so strongly on the subject. The bill failed by twenty-one votes.

"Though defeated by the 1925 General Assembly, Fundamentalism is far from a dead issue in North Carolina. The 1925 Assembly was elected before the agitation became violent, and before the triumph of Michael and his angels in Tennessee. In the election of members for the 1927 session, the war upon evolution will undoubtedly be a factor" [as we shall see presently that it was].

Miss Lewis tells us further that in the anti-evolution fight in 1925, the state university was officially represented by Pres. Harry W. Chase, "alone of the state's four higher educational institutions." He appeared at the committee hearing "in suave and civilized protest against the bill. Naturally enough—President Chase having been born in Massachusetts—the Fundamentalists cried out upon him as 'a damned Yankee who's ruinin' our boys.' "

During the battle over the Poole Bill at Raleigh in 1925, Rep. R. O. Everett, of Durham (although himself, strange to say, an anti-evolutionist), showed himself to be an able and eloquent defender of the cause of untrammeled education, and his vigorous attack on the pernicious measure aided very materially in its defeat.

The Truth Seeker for June 5, 1926, contained the following paragraph:

"One of the most recent developments is the assertion of Assemblyman D. Scott Poole, who represents the Hoke county district in the North Carolina Legislature, that if re-elected this fall he will reintroduce his bill barring the teaching of evolution from the public schools of the state. Poole's anti-evolution measure of the last session precipitated one of the hottest fights in which the North Carolina solons ever engaged."

When Mr. Poole was renominated, *The Stanley News-Herald* (Albemarle) celebrated the triumph thus:

"The nomination of D. Scott Poole to succeed himself as a member of the next General Assembly from Hoke county guarantees that the passage of a law to prevent the teaching of evolution in tax-supported schools and colleges in North Carolina will be again attempted at the coming session of the legislature. Poole was the author of the famous anti-evolution bill which caused so much discussion during the last legislature. The bill was finally killed. But Mr. Poole says he will renew his effort at the next session. And the fact that he was renominated without opposition shows that the Democratic voters and taxpayers of Hoke county are opposed to being taxed to help pay teachers to destroy the faith of their children in a personal God and in Jesus Christ. And when the majority of the voters of the entire state shall have a chance to express themselves at the polls, it will be found that about 90 per cent. of the entire voting population of North Carolina feel just about like the Hoke county voters do about it."

The Education Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, at its annual convention at Ridgecrest, North Carolina, passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the Southern Baptist Convention, at its session in Houston, adopted the following:

" 'This convention accepts Genesis as teaching that man was

a special creation of God, and rejects every theory, evolutionary or other, which teaches that man originated or came by way of lower animal ancestry,'

"Therefore the Education Board, in annual session, July 6 [1926], approves the above statement."

Even Labor has become involved in the Book of Genesis issue. At the 20th Convention of the State Federation of Labor, which opened in Salisbury on August 9, 1926, the convention adopted the proposal of J. S. Upton, of that city, placing the Federation on record as opposing the teaching of evolution in the tax-supported schools. This action was vigorously opposed by (State) Pres. C. P. Barringer, who read a letter from Pres. William Green of the American Federation of Labor, objecting to such action by state or local labor bodies and advocating freedom of thought and teaching.

Following in the wake of the evangelist-politicians, some of the more adaptable editors of North Carolina began treating a scientific issue as an ordinary political question. Editor A. C. Huneycutt, for example, of *The Stanley News-Herald*, started an editorial with these words: "*The News-Herald* has called on the men running for the General Assembly to make a statement showing the voters [all experts on biology now!] where they stand on the question of Evolution which is engaging the thoughts of so many people in this state." A pledge to introduce sectarian religious dogma in the public schools was at once forthcoming from one aspirant:

"I am heartily in favor of a law prohibiting the teaching of any theory in the state-supported schools and colleges, which might in any way tend to discredit the Holy Bible as the inspired word of God. I feel that the people who pay the taxes

to support our state schools have a perfect right to say that their children whom they are forced to send to the public schools, shall not be taught anything which might have the least tendency to weaken their faith in the religion of Jesus Christ. And, if elected, I pledge myself to support any measure which may be introduced in [the] next General Assembly designed to prohibit the teaching that man sprang from a lower form of animal, or that he was not created by God as set forth in the Book of Genesis. WADE H. LOVE."

Grateful for this confession of faith, Editor Huneycutt called upon his readers to "vote as they pray"; here is a candidate "who stands pledged to support a measure designed to see to it that [with the aid of the State police powers] the religion of our fathers shall not be thrown to the scrap-heap and replaced with a belief in a mere theory that man was not created as the Book of Genesis says he was."

Hard-hit as are the scientists of America by the all but death-dealing blows of evangelical experts in biology, now comes one Rev. Charles F. Bluske, "Inventor of the New Science of Power," who stands prepared to give the final *coup de grâce*. Writing from the Asheville Y. M. C. A., this great scientist addressed the following letter to *Harper's Magazine:*

"Hereafter, when you publish any of the 'bunk' of 'scientific world' send it to me and I'll rewrite their foolish 'stuff.' One must not make a 'jackass' of oneself, because one other one is a 'jackass.' It is time you and your silly gang wake up to this message of Christ to-day."

In an attached circular he said:

"The Inventor will give $25 in gold if he fails to make a laughing-stock out of any scientist in the world, in a debate,

proving to the public that all scientists are 'cowards'—weak in mind and body. The Inventor does not even read the rotten books of scientists and 'Modernists,' for they are below the devils in hell. . . . The Inventor will answer all things on the Bible or Nature."

If unmoved by Mr. Bluske, what could any free citizen of North Carolina do but vote against evolution after reading the following challenge from the Rev. T. T. Martin, at a mass-meeting held in Charlotte?—

"Think for yourselves, ladies and gentlemen: I employ a man to educate my boy; he drills into my boy Tom Paine's 'Age of Reason.' I object; then the state comes in and sells my home and with the money pays the teacher and says to me: 'You shall pay the teacher's salary and allow him to drill Tom Paine's "Age of Reason" into your boy.'

"That is exactly the issue, except that evolution is far worse than Tom Paine's 'Age of Reason.' God's Word says that God created great whales; evolution teaches that that is a lie; that whales used to have legs and walked around on the earth and got to going into water more and more and after millions of years evolved into whales; here it is in school books.

"God's Word teaches that God created every winged fowl. Evolution teaches that is a lie; that birds used to have four legs, but no feathers and no wings; and after millions of years evolved into birds; here it is in school books.

"God's Word teaches that God created man in His own image; evolution teaches that this is a lie, that the first man was midway between modern man and an anthropoid ape.

"God's Word teaches that the first man spoke a plain language; evolution teaches that that is a lie; that the first man had no language at all.

"God's Word teaches that the first man fell by sin, and as a result God's Son came to redeem us from all iniquity. Evolution teaches that man has never fallen but that he is always evolving upward.

"Now the Savior endorsed Genesis as the Word of God. If He endorsed a tissue of lies as God's Word, then he was not God's Son, and the world is left without a real Redeemer and without any authoritative standard of morals."

The humor of this hypocritical appeal to prejudice and ignorance is the more "fetching" when one considers that this eloquent "Defender of the Faith" was once (as mentioned in Chapter II) a teacher of biology, and that there can be no doubt whatever in his own mind that the whale was originally a land quadruped, closely related ancestrally to the sea-cow, both mammals now highly modified in adaptation to life in the water; that birds evolved from reptiles; and so on down the list. But in addressing the voters of the South it is more profitable to regard the whale as a "great fish," as taught in "the Word of God."

Notwithstanding the fact that Charlotte was the headquarters of the anti-evolution campaign, the vote of Mecklenburg county, in which that city is located, at the 1926 primaries definitely repudiated the Crusaders' candidate for the House of Representatives. An editorial in *The Montgomery Advertiser* (Alabama), July 10, 1926, throws an interesting side light on the contest:

"Two women, candidates for the North Carolina House of Representatives, took the issue of evolution to the polls. Miss Julia Alexander, of Charlotte, who served in the House during the last term and advocated the passage of an anti-evolution law similar to that of Tennessee, sought renomination. She was opposed by Miss Carrie McLean, a lawyer of Charlotte, who stressed opposition to such legislation as the principal plank in her platform. The race was one of the most hotly contested in Mecklenburg county in years, and Miss McLean unseated

Miss Alexander, winning the nomination by a majority of about 2,000 votes.

"Miss Alexander was Mecklenberg's first woman representative. Her defeat is a definite and positive victory for those who oppose legislation against evolution. Miss McLean's victory is particularly impressive, inasmuch as Miss Alexander had previously been sent to the State Assembly."

At the final election, several Republican candidates in western counties of the state based their campaigns on opposition to incumbent Democrats who had voted against the Poole Resolution.

During 1927, according to plans already made, the University of North Carolina and Wake Forest College will be subjects of attack in the Assembly, for evolutionary and other "heretical teachings."

Of the nearly three hundred so-called educational institutions under southern Baptist control—some called colleges, but many in reality inferior to most country high schools—virtually all are "citadels of orthodoxy." In these schools the teaching of evolution is forbidden, and intelligent study of the books of the Bible is unknown. The only near-liberal Bible scholar in any of these denominational schools is Dr. William L. Poteat, the (recently resigned) president of Wake Forest College, at Wake Forest, North Carolina; and he is constantly under Fundamentalist fire for having written a book denouncing bigotry and narrowness in interpreting the Scriptures. Nevertheless, when directly challenged by the die-hards to state his beliefs plainly, Dr. Poteat replied:

"I have your letter asking me if I subscribe to the paragraph in the statement of the Wake Forest Alumni referring

to the inspiration of the Scriptures, the Divine Agency in creation, the fall of man, our Lord's birth of the Virgin Mary, His atonement, resurrection, and coming again. I am very pleased to answer that I do subscribe to that paragraph."

But even this statement is not satisfactory to the rabid Fundamentalists. It seems that Dr. Poteat has not been willing to disavow acceptance of evolution "as a theory." After having been a storm-center among North Carolina Baptists because of his more or less Modernistic views, Dr. Poteat resigned in November, 1926 (following a quarter of a century of service), the resignation to take effect at commencement in June, 1927.

North Carolina justly boasts the civilizing influence of four or five institutions of learning which will compare favorably in academic standing with a number of the larger colleges and universities of the United States. And one notes with pleasure that the (approximately 250) members of the North Carolina Academy of Science show no signs of retreating from their position as unyielding champions of evolution and of academic freedom. At the twenty-fifth annual meeting of this learned body, at Wake Forest College, April 30 and May 1, 1926, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"The North Carolina Academy of Science desires to reiterate that if the present rate of progress and enlightenment in the state of North Carolina is to be maintained and advanced, it is absolutely and unqualifiedly necessary that all those hypotheses, theories, laws and facts which constitute the legitimate content of any field of study may be dealt with at any time by any teachers.

"The academy goes on record as endorsing most emphati-

cally the stand of Dr. H. W. Chase and Dr. W. L. Poteat on the freedom of thought and teaching."

On May 4, 1926, a committee of one hundred "throwbacks" from various sections of the state met in Charlotte, to welcome the Rev. T. T. Martin, hero of the successful Mississippi fight on evolution, who had been selected to lead the impending battle in North Carolina. In this work he was assisted fervently, if not wisely, by the Fundamentalist orator, Rev. Charles F. Bluske, of Asheville, *Harper's* kindly adviser. A vivid idea of the character of the support given the anti-evolutionists by Mr. Bluske may be gained from the perusal of the following example of his method of "exposing the fallacies of the evolution hoax" (quoted in *The American Mercury*, February, 1926):

"After many years of study I have found that every Bolshevist of Russia, Socialist, Infidel and Anarchist, believes in evolution. . . . This gang of infidels is joined by a narrow-minded set of devil-bound evolution preachers, who stand in the church and blaspheme Christ, denying His virgin birth, atonement, divinity and resurrection; in other words, they are jackass preachers without faith. This gang consists of newspaper editors and scientists, who *should be exiled out of our country* for insulting the high moral standard of the creation of human life, Christianity and civilization, for they are not one hundred per cent. American, but an insane set of ignorant, educated fools, who insist on lowering their own organic life to that of a monkey or animal. Take a jackass, a hog and a skunk and tie them together and you have a scientific evolutionist or a Modernist. If men once evolved, then, some time in the past, an oak tree was a pine tree, and a hickory nut tree a walnut tree. There is no such nutty law in creation."

The foregoing sample of Fundamentalist "argument" is by no means exceptional in either viciousness or

stupidity. It is typical of the sort of stuff that has been poured into the ears of the common people of the Fundamentalist Belt for some years, and for which the late Colonel Bryan was largely responsible. David Warren Ryder, editor of *The San Francisco Review,* in a comparative estimate of the influence on modern thought of Burbank and Bryan (*Haldeman-Julius Monthly*, June, 1926), pointed out the probable consequences of Bryan's propaganda had he lived to continue his work of discord:

"Had it not been for the comparative enlightenment of the age, the preaching and the influence of Bryan would have created and set in motion another bloody, terrible Inquisition. Whatever his motives may have been; whatever the intent of his words and his deeds, the effect of them was to foster ignorance and to breed and augment intolerance. Had he lived another five years it is not improbable, despite the enlightenment of the day, that the hands of men might have been raised against each other in active, open religious warfare."

What Mr. Ryder fails to realize is that the sudden death of Bryan in no way halted the Fundamentalist propaganda of intolerance, hatred, bigotry and violence. As a matter of fact, Bryan's so-called martyrdom has had the opposite effect—as is clearly shown in the course of this volume.

The Charlotte Observer comments as follows upon the work of Mr. Martin's Committee of One Hundred:

"It is evident that the committee is in the field for results. And the determination manifested in the resolution is one of approval by the large majority of the people of the state. Many towns and counties have already fortified their schools' interests by insuring that no teacher of objectionable doctrine

shall be on the payroll. The argument is all with those who contend that teachers in the employ of the state should not draw state money and teach a doctrine repugnant to state interests."

We learn from *The Crusaders' Champion* (June 18, 1926), that, according to the Rev. S. F. Conrad, of Charlotte:

"There is not a preacher in North Carolina who has any self-respect will come out openly and say I swallow the Germ Theory of Creation. No Evolution educator or Tiny Germ Evolutionist can go before our people and talk Christian education with an Evolution badge pinned upon the lapel of his coat. If I had a billion of dollars I'd never give a dollar to a school where Evolution as the interpretation of the Bible account of creation is taught."

T. T. Martin is Secretary General of the North Carolina Anti-Evolution League, in addition to his activities and official connections with the Bible Crusaders. The Committee of One Hundred is (according to reports) acting independently of the Crusaders.

The Baltimore Sun reports thus the meeting of Martin's committee to frame a platform:

"A handful of Modernists who attended objected to a campaign to secure anti-evolutionary legislation. Fundamentalists jumped to their feet. 'Everybody who questions the infallibility of the Bible is an Atheist,' asserted one.

" 'Don't make this a church war,' objected a Modernist. 'You're a lot of scared preachers gathered together. I've listened to your voices and seen your actions to-day and I tell you I'm discouraged. I'm going to ask you not to start things with which you have no concern. Go home to your churches and preach the word of God. Let the school boards do their

work. I've got to tell you again you're scared preachers, and I'm bitterly discouraged.'

" 'I resent such an insult,' cried a preacher, tearing off his coat and rushing down the aisle. 'I'll not let it go unchallenged. I'll meet you anywhere.' He was subdued by a number of his colleagues, but no sooner was he quiet than another preacher rushed forward. 'I, too, resent that slur on clergymen,' he shouted; 'I'll meet you outside anywhere, any time, and make you answer for that.'

"By this time the meeting was breaking up in confusion. The program was adopted in a hasty vote. In the scramble for the exits an aged preacher paused. 'If Jesus were here,' he quavered, 'what would he think?' The pastor of the church where the meeting was held bowed his head in his hands. 'In my church,' he moaned, 'in the house of God!'

"The Modernists sat still."

Before adjourning *sine die*, the Committee of One Hundred (representing one hundred counties) passed a somewhat lengthy resolution, from which I excerpt the more significant paragraphs:

"We hold that it is not sufficient for a teacher to justify himself in his disbelief that the Bible is the word of God upon the ground that he does not teach this in his class, inasmuch as education is by life as well as by lip and by example as well as by precept [meaning that all teachers should be avowed Fundamentalists, "by life"]. . . . We challenge the right of those in charge of our state schools to employ teachers who hold views fundamentally contrary to the simple teachings of the Bible and force the tax-payers to pay the bills. . . . It is incumbent upon us to avail ourselves of our constitutional rights [?] and apply to the Legislature for redress of our grievances."

Dr. B. W. Wells of the North Carolina State College, in a communication to *Science* (July 2, 1926), says,

with reference to this organized attempt to abolish freedom of teaching in North Carolina:

"The boards of trustees and the administrations of the three state institutions, the University of North Carolina, the North Carolina College for Women, and the North Carolina State College, now face a modern Protestant holy inquisition. It is of course unthinkable that these bodies will in any degree whatsoever meet the desires of the Fundamentalists, so that the latter will be forced to carry their fight into the Legislature of next winter.

"Well financed, the Committee of One Hundred has imported fifteen speakers under the direction of Mr. T. T. Martin, . . . who will, in addition to local talent, prepare the counties for the primaries where the next Legislature is made. There seems to be little doubt that this theological raid on education in North Carolina will assume much more serious proportions than it did a year and a half ago when an anti-evolution bill met defeat. The Rev. Mr. Martin states that North Carolina is 'pivotal' and that if it can be won the nation can be won also. An interesting corollary is a possible paradoxical situation created by the fact that the Baptist and Methodist institutions, Wake Forest and Duke, respectively, are standing firm for freedom of teaching. Thus in case the Fundamentalists swamp the state institutions, it would become desirable, to prevent the 'ruin of youth,' to transfer the young men in the church schools to the 'safe' state Fundamentalist colleges."

Martin's general challenge to all evolutionists who would dare to face him on a public platform to debate the question of evolution was accepted by Howell S. England, an attorney and student of science of Detroit. Mr. England is an official of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism (incorporated in New York) and accepted Martin's challenge as a representative of that organization. The debates were to be held

in various cities in North Carolina and were to be continued for two weeks, the first two to be held in Charlotte on May 31 and June 1, 1926.

The plan of holding these debates was opposed by a number of the daily papers and by many Fundamentalists. The Ku Klux Klan declared that no Atheist would be permitted to debate the evolution question in North Carolina. To be sure, the Bill of Rights (Article I, Section 19) guarantees to every citizen the liberty freely to "speak, write and print on any subject, being responsible for the abuse of that liberty"; and denies (Section 3) that any human authority can interfere with rights of conscience, prescribing that no preference shall be given by law to any mode of worship; while it also (Section 4) forbids any religious test as a qualification to office or public trust; and states (Section 6) that no religious test shall be made as a qualification for jury service. Nevertheless, the one hundred per cent. Americans of the Ku Klux Klan declared that they would set up a "religious test" even in the matter of a public debate between citizens of this country; as shown by an article in *The Charlotte Observer* of May 23rd:

"The Ku Klux Klan of the Queen City, soon after the challenge was extended, held a meeting and decided definitely and positively that no Atheist should speak in that city.

"Just what method would be employed to prevent an Atheist from speaking was not disclosed, but there was no indecision as to the determination that one should not speak in the city, on the ground that it would not be for the best interest of a religious and church-going community for a non-believer in God and the Bible to be spreading his propaganda among the people.

"Suggestion was made that a delegation of the robed knights

might meet any such outsider at the station when he alighted from the train and give him a quick send-off, probably on the same train bringing him in, if it passed through, or on the next one going out. Another suggestion was that efforts should be made to get the city and county officials to decline to allow any public building to be used for such a debate, and that others having charge of buildings in which it could be held be urged not to permit their use. . . . The developments will be watched with interest."

In a report to *The Truth Seeker*, Linn A. E. Gale, president of the Association Opposed to Blue Laws, said that:

"While other North Carolina papers were in many cases objecting to the debate, . . . *The Carolina Independent* and *The Durham County Progress* endorsed the debate and predicted that reports that the Ku Klux Klan would interfere were false. The debate proved a very orderly affair. . . . These papers are now advocating that the plan of conducting debates in fourteen or fifteen other North Carolina cities be carried out, and state that such discussions are highly educational.

"Intelligent journalistic voices are not numerous yet and the papers in question are among the minority. Happily, however, the minority is growing."

These papers are owned by Walter W. Weaver, a well known liberal publisher of the South and the Middle West.

While it is true that two debates were held without physical molestation on the part of the local Klan, nevertheless it was soon recognized that the advertised series in other cities could not be given without serious embarrassment, involving considerable financial loss. Heavy

pressure was brought to bear on the city officials of Charlotte and also on the owners of buildings, by both the Klan and the church people. The result was that no hall could be secured, and it became necessary to employ a dance pavilion outside the city limits in order to hold the debates. At the first debate, according to the local paper already quoted, about 250 persons were present, of whom only 186 had paid the admission fee of fifty cents.

The subject of the debate was: "Should the teaching of evolution, that man descended from a lower order of animals, be excluded from the tax-supported schools?" Applause was given to both speakers, the small audience being fairly divided in its sympathies.

Martin took advantage of the occasion to brand the University of Chicago as a "slaughter-house of faith"—a phrase borrowed from a Fundamentalist work written under the pseudonym of "O. B. Server." Replying to Mr. England's statement that North Carolina was to be congratulated on its refusal to pass the anti-evolution bill, Martin said: "If men were not afraid [of becoming, as Mr. England put it, "a laughing-stock to the country"], North Carolina would have passed the bill. However, not only will North Carolina pass it soon, but Kentucky, Texas, Pennsylvania and even Michigan will pass a similar bill."

Although it cannot be denied that Fundamentalist forces are very strong in Pennsylvania, there seems no immediate danger of an anti-evolution bill's being passed there; and the mention of Michigan was probably merely a slap at Mr. England's home state. But

Martin was almost certainly correct in his predictions concerning Kentucky and Texas; and North Carolina, as has been shown, is still in great peril.

Dr. Ernest M. Poate, a well known attorney of North Carolina, informs me that, "while there is, of course, a considerable body of militantly Fundamentalist opinion in North Carolina," there is, nevertheless, not the "slightest likelihood" that any anti-evolution law can be passed at present in that state, though such bills will be introduced.

"As for the Fundamentalist Committee of One Hundred, that has just about petered out. There were too many shades of Fundamentalist opinion; its members began almost at once to read each other out of the fold. It was originally organized by agitators from the north—which alone would have killed the scheme. The comments of our state press have been almost uniformly hostile to this committee; mostly in a semi-humorous fashion. [*The Raleigh Times* was even made the object of a libel suit by a Fundamentalist minister from Fuquay Springs because of its remarks about him.] It is not taken seriously. Do not misunderstand me. There is a large body of opinion in North Carolina which objects to the whole theory of evolution upon religious grounds. But—because we have the reputation of being the most progressive of the southern states; because our people are justly proud of this reputation; because our public opinion, generally, is more enlightened and fair-minded than that in Tennessee (for example); because, with the action of that state before us, even our convinced Fundamentalists hesitate to make of this state also a laughing-stock; because the majority of our people, as I believe, are too firmly convinced of the value of free speech and free thought to a free people; and, finally, because a very influential minority (ably represented by such men as Dr. Poteat of Wake Forest whom the Fundamentalists failed to have read out of the Baptist Church for heresy on this

very point) is—as educated men must be—fully persuaded of the essential truth of the theory of evolution, and realizes its absolute necessity as a basis for all scientific teaching:—for all these reasons, . . . there is no likelihood that any anti-evolution statute will be passed, or even seriously considered, by our General Assembly. . . .

"Happily, I am able to say for North Carolina that neither the Ku Klux Klan nor the militant Fundamentalists, nor any others of that ilk, are of sufficient importance or influence to menace our free institutions."

On the other hand, Prof. B. W. Wells, previously quoted, writes me that while the Fundamentalist drive in relation to the spring primaries was a failure (the officers are in reality elected at the primaries in this Democratic state), the anti-evolution agitators

"are already [December 11, 1926] again astir in this state and are getting their forces organized for a new attack on the coming legislature which meets in January. It will be a matter of much interest to see how far the Committee of One Hundred, now calling themselves the North Carolina Bible League, will be able to resuscitate their cause, which so nearly died through the summer and fall."

Poole re-introduced his anti-evolution bill in the House of Representatives early in the 1927 session, as expected. At the time Zeb Vance Turlington, anti-evolution leader in the General Assembly, announced that he had the signatures of 15,000 voters petitioning for passage of the Poole Bill. (The population of North Carolina is only about 2,500,000.) However, the liberal and progressive forces of the state campaigned hard against it; and on February 15th the committee on education reported it adversely, by a vote of 25 to 11. A

week later the bill was withdrawn by its proponents, in the face of its certain defeat. The House had a very full program, including legislation for increase of Confederate pensions, a cause in which Mr. Turlington has been very active; and undoubtedly this was a determining factor in the withdrawal of the bill. North Carolina has therefore been saved, until 1929 at least.

CHAPTER V

THE THREATENED SOUTH

LTHOUGH Tennessee and Mississippi are the only states in which, at this writing, anti-evolution laws are in effect, a serious menace exists in several other parts of the country south of the Mason and Dixon line—as we have seen in the chapters on Louisiana and North Carolina. Only nine states were in regular legislative session anywhere in the United States in 1926, which means that thirty-nine legislatures convene in 1927, many of them in the South. Several southern states in which such legislative or extra-legislative attacks on evolution have already been attempted in the past, and hence are especially probable in the future, are here grouped in one chapter.

It is claimed by the Fundamentalists that they constitute a large majority of the voters of this country, and so far as many sections of the country are concerned, they are undoubtedly right in their estimate. And this is what gives to the present verbal and legislative war on science its ominous tone. Ignorant clergymen, backed by equally uncultured lawmakers, constitute, with their fanatical following, a very real danger.

But the trouble in some sections of the South (and other parts of the Union) is that they are infested by a horde of uneducated evangelists. N. D. Cochran has en-

tered a protest against the starvation wages paid these "pestilential"—but in many cases well-meaning—"servants of the Lord." He quotes the Rev. Jeff D. Ray, of Little Rock, Arkansas, who says in *The Baptist Advance:*

"The tragedy of nine tenths of our rural pastorates is due to crude, unscientific and unscriptural practices in the matter of pastoral relations and support. The preacher must give much of his time to some secular work to keep the wolf from his door."

On which *The Baptist Advance* comments: "Certainly a church that is on the bedrocks financially will take the preach out of any man."

Mr. Cochran has given some statistical data on this situation which will serve as a necessary introduction to this chapter; hence his contribution is quoted at some length.

"This is not merely a Baptist problem. It is a national problem. Roughly, there are 8,000,000 Baptists in the United States and about the same number of Methodists. These two churches are the strongest in numbers of any of the Protestant churches. This vast number of Americans looks to its pastors not only for spiritual guidance, but also for social, educational and political leadership.

"The U. S. census report for 1920 shows that the percentage of illiteracy is highest in those states where Baptists are more numerous. Among native-born whites alone the percentage of illiteracy runs as follows: Alabama, 6.3; Georgia, 5.4; Kentucky, 7; Louisiana, 11.4; Mississippi, 3.6; North Carolina, 6.8; South Carolina, 6.5; Tennessee, 7.3; Texas 3; Virginia, 5.9; West Virginia, 4.6.

"Compare with these states other states in the union where the percentage of illiterate among the native-born whites is very

low, to-wit: Connecticut, .4; Idaho, .3; Iowa, .5; Nevada, .4; New York, .5; North Dakota, .4; Oregon, .4; South Dakota, .4; Utah, .3; Washington, .3; Wyoming, .3. None of these with a percentage higher than ½ of 1 per cent.

"Over half of all church members in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia are Baptists. They outnumber all other denominations in Arkansas, Florida, Kentucky, Missouri, Oklahoma, Tennessee and Texas.

"In the three states that have outlawed evolution and take their science from Genesis the census figures are as follows:

"Of 762,977 church members in Mississippi, 226,356 are Methodists and 441,293 Baptists. Of 840,133 church members in Tennessee, 286,143 are Methodists and 320,442 Baptists. Of 1,784,620 church members in Texas, 418,121 are Methodists and 646,494 Baptists.

"Kentucky, which came within one legislative vote of barring evolution, has 967,602 church members, of whom 155,129 are Methodists and 721,140 Baptists.

"In Georgia, home of the Ku Klux Klan, there are 1,234,132 church members, of whom 387,775 are Methodists and 721,140 Baptists.

"What the figures mean is that bigotry and intolerance thrive best where the percentage of illiteracy or ignorance is highest. Bear in mind that the percentage of illiteracy here given, and taken from the U. S. census reports for 1920, means percentage of native-born whites over 10 years of age who can neither read nor write.

"This illiteracy is found highest where Baptist and Methodist preachers are poorest paid. That's why I say it is a national problem and that all of us are interested in having preachers of all denominations well-educated, well-housed and well-fed —in other words well-paid."

The fact that Mr. Cochran's figures are derived from impartial official sources, compiled by statisticians who are in no way interested in the question of anti-evolution

activities, should exempt both this able journalist and the present writer from any charge of "casting slurs on religion" as it is propounded in the South—and also from that of "casting slurs on the South" (aside from the purely personal fact that I myself am a southerner and the son of a Confederate veteran). The facts must be faced, and these facts may serve as a basis for some practical method of averting the undeniable evils that must inevitably flow from them. The exercise of political power coupled with ignorance cannot but result, eventually, in the overthrow of the present form of government in the United States.

H. L. Mencken has clearly pointed out (*The American Mercury*, November, 1925) the menace attaching to the presence in our midst of thousands of blind leaders of the blind among the rural clergy. As he only too truly says:

"They constitute, perhaps, the most ignorant class of teachers ever set up to lead a civilized people; they are even more ignorant than the county superintendent of schools. . . . Is he [the country preacher] commonly sent, as a preliminary, to a training-camp, to college? But what a college! You will find one in every mountain valley of the land, with its single building in a bare pasture lot, and its faculty of half-idiot pedagogues and broken-down preachers. One man, in such a college, teaches oratory, ancient history, arithmetic and Old Testament exegesis. The aspirant comes in from the barnyard, and goes back in a year or two to the village. His body of knowledge is that of a street-car conductor or a movie actor. . . . It is from such ignoramuses that the American peasantry gets its views of the cosmos. Certainly Fundamentalism should not be hard to understand when its sources are inspected. . . . What comes to him, vaguely and distorted, is unintelligible to him. He is suspicious of it—afraid of it—

and he quickly communicates his fears to his dupes. . . . They are specialists in alarms and bugaboos. The rum demon, Atheists, Bolsheviki, the Pope, bootleggers, Leopold and Loeb —all these have served them in turn, and in the demonology of the Ku Klux Klan all have been conveniently brought together—along with evolution. . . . The cities laugh at the yokels, but meanwhile the politicians take careful notice; such mountebanks as Peay of Tennessee and Blease of South Carolina have already issued their preliminary whoops. As the tide rolls up the pastors will attain to greater and greater consequence. Already, indeed, they swell visibly, in power and pretension. . . . They are everywhere on display, leading the anthropoid host. . . . It is well in such matters to see clearly ahead. The United States grows increasingly urban, but its ideas are hatched in the little towns. What the swineherds credit to-day is whooped to-morrow in Congress, and then comes upon the cities suddenly with all the force of law. . . . It was not the bawling of the mountebank Bryan, but the sermon of a mountain Bossuet, that laid the train of the Scopes case and made a whole state forever ridiculous."

SOUTH CAROLINA

South Carolina was one of the first states to be drawn into a legislative battle for freedom in teaching. In 1921 a rider was attached by its Senate to the general appropriation bill, providing that "no moneys appropriated for public education or for the maintenance or support of state-supported institutions shall be used or paid to any such school or institution teaching, or permitting to be taught, as a creed to be followed, the cult known as 'Darwinism.' "

Senator Miller, author of the rider, explained that it applied only to "Darwinism," and not to "the evolutionary theories of Lamarck, Bergson, Osborn and others"!

The amendment passed the Senate without opposition, but was stricken out of the bill by the joint committee.

In May, 1926, Prof. A. L. Pickens, head of the department of biology at Furman College, South Carolina (a Baptist institution), was constrained to resign "as a result of a clash of views on evolution with trustees of the institution."

A prominent official of the Bible Crusaders recently stated that a vigorous attack on evolution would be made during the next session of the South Carolina Legislature. Such a bill, Rep. Thomas H. Peeples, of Richland county, has announced that he is preparing, to be introduced at the next session. United States Senator Cole Blease has written Peeples that he prefers something "more stringent"—whatever that means. Perhaps we can gain some idea of what the Senator means by "more stringent" from a speech he made at Greenville on July 14, 1925. Here he declared that not only is he opposed to the teaching of evolutionary theory, but that he would, if he could, compel all school teachers "to take an obligation admitting their belief in the Deity of Jesus Christ."

This is in harmony with an editorial in *The Biblical Recorder* which states that "every teacher in a Christian [public] school should be an avowed Christian who is not ashamed to let the world know that he considers Christianity a vital matter."

Senator Blease also informed the United States Senate, on June 16, 1926, that the nation is being ruined by "so-called education." He said that he had "seen very few people who claimed to be educated who ever would work."

The Protestant Fundamentalists are not alone in their war on evolution in this state. Just what stand the Roman Catholics of South Carolina will take on the evolution controversy may or may not be divined from the following statement of the Right Rev. William T. Russell, Catholic ordinary of the diocese of Charleston: "It does look like an ape might have developed into a man, but we have no instance of it." This sentence is surely worthy of W. B. Riley!

Unless active defensive measures are soon taken, South Carolina will revert to the days of 1887, when the Rev. Dr. James Woodrow (uncle of the late President Wilson), a professor in the Presbyterian Seminary at Columbia, was tried for heresy before the Presbyterian General Council, in Baltimore, for accepting the theory of evolution "as true."

Dr. Woodrow had openly espoused the theory of evolution, and in his defense stated his conviction that "evolution as a biological hypothesis had no more to do with the Bible and theology than the multiplication table." He said that while the Bible recounted the fact of creation, it "was most eloquently silent regarding the method." (As to this, there is considerable difference of viewpoint among educated persons.)

This note is based upon a statement made at Atlantic City, on July 13, 1925, by the Rev. Dr. Thornton Whaling, professor of theology in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Louisville, Kentucky, and a pupil of Dr. Woodrow's. Dr. Whaling expressed himself as being in accord with Dr. Woodrow's views.

A citizen of South Carolina, J. R. King, writes that the common people of his state are "fast losing their

thinking faculty for lack of use. Generations of religion have produced a generation of religious fanatics. . . . Unless there is help from the outside, the South is headed for a darker period than the Dark Ages."

KENTUCKY

Section 4368 of the Kentucky Statutes of 1905 might be invoked without further legislation to bar the teaching of evolution in that state—as evolution is interpreted by the Fundamentalists. It reads:

> "No books or other publications of a sectarian, infidel or immoral character shall be used or distributed in any common school; nor shall any sectarian, infidel, or immoral doctrine be taught therein."

The chief point stressed by the anti-evolutionists is, of course, that evolution is opposed to the Biblical account of creation, and is therefore "infidel." But they also contend that it is an immoral, soul-destroying doctrine, and hence can be taught only in violation of Section 4368.

Nevertheless, a specific bill forbidding the teaching of evolution in the tax-supported educational institutions of Kentucky was introduced into the lower house of the Legislature in 1921. The penalty for violation of the proposed statute was to be a heavy fine and a jail sentence. After a heated debate, this measure was defeated by the perilously close vote of 42 to 41.

During the year following, the anti-evolution agitation was continued, and the Baptists of Kentucky decided that they would "give no financial aid to any school or

college in which the theory of evolution was expounded."

Encouraged by the close vote, Bryan was engaged by the Blue Grass Fundamentalists to convince the voters that the theory of evolution not only was the cause of the World War, but also was contradicted by all the "scientific facts" known to the Commoner, to W. B. Riley, and to the Rev. Billy Sunday.

Disgusted with the puerile talk of the Peerless Orator, Dr. Ralph G. Demaree, professor of physics at the Kentucky Wesleyan College, in an address to the student body, described Bryan as "a thoroughly discredited thinker." He also claimed that the theory of evolution as held by modern scientists "reconciled absolutely" with the Biblical account of creation, and said that he had "no use" for the opinions of men who attempted to prevent the teaching of evolution. Editors of the college paper were refused permission by Pres. William Campbell to print Professor Demaree's address. In April, 1923, he was suspended, but was finally reinstated after he had signed a statement regretting "any damage" to the college caused by his address, and promising to refrain from official discussion of the subject so long as he retained his position.

Dr. Burton E. Livingston, permanent secretary of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and professor of plant physiology at Johns Hopkins University, did not hesitate to say of Mr. Bryan that when Bryan said—as he never failed to do, being an expert phrasemonger—that it is more important to know the Rock of Ages than the Age of Rocks, he said "a perfectly asinine thing. It means nothing." Dr. Livingston

said further (to a representative of *The Boston Traveler*):

"It is very urgent that men of science should stand together against the attacks, and move together over the obstacles that are cleverly prepared by the unknowing partisans of moribund ignorance, prejudice and superstition. It lies in the evolution of things that such opposition must always be with us, and, equally, that those who understand science should combine to overcome the opposition."

At a meeting of the citizens and patrons of the schools of Springfield, Kentucky, the following resolution was passed (as reported in *The Sun*, February 14, 1924):

"That the teaching of biology or any kindred subject is objectionable to a large majority of the patrons of the school; and whereas we have found from experience that the subject of biology so readily lends itself to the teaching of evolution, we ask that it be eliminated from the curriculum of said school and some other subject taught instead."

Dr. Arthur M. Miller, emeritus professor of geology in the University of Kentucky (Lexington), tells us in *The Lexington Herald* (June 28, 1925) that "a minister of the Disciples' faith succeeded last year in getting excluded from the curriculum of the public schools of Springfield, Kentucky, the sciences of geology and biology, on the ground that these sciences could not be taught without teaching evolution."

Professor Miller stated further that, in an address delivered in Kentucky, former Governor Morrison, of North Carolina, denounced biology and geology as "nonsense," with the apparent approval of the great

majority of his auditors. Yet, as Dr. Miller pointed out:

"To attempt to teach either of them without involving and implicating this doctrine would be like trying to play 'Hamlet' with Hamlet left out.

"Biology has many branches. If biology is to be excluded, so also must comparative anatomy, a thorough laboratory course in which Huxley said would cure any anti-evolutionist. So also must nature study, for, as the distinguished scientist, Dr. David Starr Jordan, Chancellor Emeritus of Leland Stanford University, has said, 'No naturalist could refuse to believe in the mutability of species and look an animal in the face.' Embryology is saturated with evolution, its fundamental principle being the famous law of Von Baer, the founder of the science, that true relationships in animals are best disclosed by a study of their embryonic development."

But facts have no meaning for a Fundamentalist where his "faith" is concerned. So the war on science went on apace, and on January 18, 1926, a bill was again introduced into the Kentucky Legislature, almost identical with the Tennessee law, though it carried no penalty other than "cancellation of teaching contract." The bill, fathered by Rep. Grover Cleveland Johnson, of Hardin county, was adversely reported in February by the Committee on Education, and was defeated in due order. Johnson then drafted a new measure, "to prevent atheistic teaching" in the schools—"atheistic teaching" being, of course, any teaching of scientifically verified facts not in harmony with Fundamentalist dogma.

Persistent to the end, Johnson precipitated a wordy battle in Kentucky's lower house when he presented (February 11th) a resolution endorsing the action of

the Mississippi House, which had meanwhile voted to outlaw the teaching of evolutionary theory. Both these later measures were defeated.

On March 7, 1926, the Fundamentalists' Association was formed at Wilmore, Kentucky, with the avowed purpose of fighting "in every state, the theory of evolution as a fact," and "to try to prohibit the teaching of evolution in all educational institutions supported by public money." "We believe," says their announcement, "in the divine and special creation of man according to the Genesis account"—meaning the conflicting accounts given in the first and second chapters of Genesis.

An intensive propaganda program is now in progress throughout the state, preparatory to the next struggle in the Legislature.

At the annual meeting of the Kentucky Academy of Science, May 1, 1926, the retiring president, Dr. Austin R. Middleton, of the University of Louisville, reported upon 132 essays on evolution written by students of the department of biology. Only five held that evolution is not true. Of the remainder, eighty declared that what they had learned about evolution while at the university had strengthened their religious beliefs. Not one said that his religious beliefs had been adversely affected. (The religious beliefs of these students, apparently, had not been based upon a literal interpretation of Genesis.)

Because she declined to repudiate the theory of evolution, Miss Lela V. Scopes, sister of John T. Scopes of Dayton fame, and a teacher of mathematics, was denied a renewal of her position on the faculty of the Paducah schools, at the time of her brother's arrest.

In June, 1926, two teachers in the Tilghman High School, Paducah,—Miss Esther Smith, biology instructor, and Mrs. Aimee Buchanan, head of the English department,—were charged by the Paducah Board of Education with having taught the doctrine of evolution in their classes, and their reappointment for another term was refused. On June 10th, the board attempted to prove that Miss Smith had taught "matter that undermined the religious faith of the pupils in her classes." Not a single witness was produced to substantiate the charge, and Miss Smith was reinstated. The case against Mrs. Buchanan was also dropped, thanks largely to a vigorous protest on the part of her pupils' parents.

The match that set off this local Fundamentalist magazine was discovered in the person of a traveling evangelist, not of Kentucky, but from a foreign country—to wit, British Columbia. It seems that while the local czars of education have issued a ukase against freedom in teaching the best results of modern scientific research, the public schools are thrown wide open to local or traveling evangelists who desire to repudiate science in favor of Semitic mythology. Thus, in the middle of April, a Rev. Dr. Arthur I. Brown, of Vancouver (who seems to be the same "Arthur I. Brown, M.D., C.M., F.R.C.S.E." of the International Advisory Council of the Bible Crusaders), had been given the platform in the Tilghman High School in order to repeat an anti-evolution sermon previously delivered in the First Baptist Church of Paducah. After hearing this exponent of Chaldean cosmology and biology, some of the students asked Mrs. Buchanan what she thought of Dr. Brown's discourse, in which modern evolutionists were held up

to scorn. Mrs. Buchanan could but reply that she considered that the learned clergyman had treated the problems of evolutionary science "very unscientifically."

On the other hand, Mrs. Buchanan said, she did not attempt to teach them evolution. "I am not competent to do that," she stated. The only reference she had otherwise made to evolution occurred when her students happened to be studying the Victorian period of English Literature, in which reference was made to Huxley as a model writer of scientific prose, though the contributions of Darwin were also mentioned in passing. It was at this very time, merely by coincidence, that Dr. Brown was exposing the "ignorance" of Darwin and Huxley to Mrs. Buchanan's pupils.

Miss Smith also, as might be expected, was asked a number of questions by her pupils in biology regarding the statements made concerning this department of science by the evangelist. Among these assertions was Dr. Brown's charge that the text-books used by Miss Smith were "full of lies." *The Paducah News-Democrat* published a statement by Miss Smith covering this point:

> "The students who had been studying biology under my instruction asked me if this was true, and of course I told them that I did not agree with Dr. Brown. I could not say that I had been teaching out of a text-book of lies, and there was no reason for such a statement."

Miss Smith, realizing that Fundamentalists largely control the public schools of Kentucky, had always studiously avoided any discussion of the origin of man, and never discussed "Darwinism" as such. "As a teacher of biology," she explained, "I have not been

able to avoid discussion of the evolution of animal forms, but I have not taught the evolution of man."

While the anti-evolution evangelists were urging the constituents of the Kentucky legislators to demand a law "with teeth in it" prohibiting the teaching of evolution, the state lawmakers were the recipients of numerous telegrams and letters of protest from various parts of the Republic—it being fully realized by scholars and scientists, and by some liberal religious organizations, that this question cannot be considered a merely local issue of no concern to the nation as a whole. Two typical expressions of disapproval may be cited. Charles MacFarland, General Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches in America, New York City, sent a telegram in behalf of his organization in which he declared that "any attempt to impose legislative restrictions on the teachers of science is contrary to all principles on which the American Republic has been founded." Robert L. Kelly, Executive Secretary of the Association of American Colleges, said:

> "In the name of two hundred and fifty colleges and universities located in forty-two states, we pray Kentucky will not commit intellectual suicide by prohibiting the teaching of evolution or the use of books favoring evolution."

As previously stated, the bill failed, but the battle will be renewed in the next session of the State Legislature, backed by the Bible Crusaders, the Ku Klux Klan and the Supreme Kingdom.

The failure of the Fundamentalists to rush through an anti-evolution bill in Kentucky in 1926 has by no means diminished the ardor of the enemies of progress. On

September 13th, at Harlan, southeast of Lexington, the Rev. J. R. Black, pastor of the Baptist Church, called for a public burning of a number of books which are obnoxious to Crusaders. Among the works declared to be "poisonous and unfit to be read by people" was H. G. Wells' "Outline of History." The first volume of this widely popular work was especially anathematized as advocating the damnable theory of evolution. Curiously enough, Zane Grey's "To the Last Man" was consigned to the flames along with the "Outline of History," and a number of other books not mentioned in the press reports of the incident. That which cannot be outlawed by statute can at least be destroyed by the purging flames of public bonfires.

"In consigning the Sunday *Louisville Courier-Journal* to the flames," comments *The Truth Seeker*, "Mr. Black said that he did not condemn the reading of that or any other newspaper, but that his objection to the Sunday newspapers was that they consumed too much time which ought to be devoted to the service of the Lord. He said he never allowed his Sunday newspaper to be delivered at his home until the following Monday."

The anti-evolution forces of Kentucky are now mourning the temporary loss of a statesman who was for years a loyal Crusader and Defender of the Faith and a staunch opponent of the "demoralizing doctrine of evolution." Supported in every contest for re-election by the full strength of the Kentucky Anti-Saloon League and the foes of "Darwinism," the Hon. John W. Langley ably represented the Tenth District of that state in the Congress for many years. Missing the efficient beverage so highly appreciated by the Fundamentalist mountain-

eers, among whom he was known as "a regular fellow," this eloquent defender of the truth of Genesis accidentally—we must believe—aided several of his fellow-Fundamentalists in separating tons of excellent bonded whiskey from federal warehouses, diverting it to illicit channels. "For this mixing of private and public morality an unfeeling government sent him to Atlanta Penitentiary, where he now sits, a manacled St. George of the mountains, powerless to fight either the demon rum or the dragon of evolution." (He was paroled December 18, 1926.)

However, at the November elections (1926), his wife was elected to Congress in his stead, and may be depended on to carry out her husband's principles in respect to both his chief interests.

GEORGIA

During the summer of 1923 (July 10th), Bryan addressed the Georgia House of Representatives in a plea for the prohibition of "the teaching of Darwinism as a fact." Shortly thereafter, Representative Pope, of Walker county, introduced the following bill (House Bill No. 731, 1923):

"To be entitled an Act to prohibit and prevent the teaching or sanctioning of the so-called Darwin or *other theory* of Evolution of Man from the Ape, Monkey or other lower Animal, in the public schools and Colleges and other institutions supported or receiving support from the State and for other purposes.

"Section 1. Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same, That from and after the passage of this Act, it shall

be illegal and unlawful to teach, sanction or *approve* of the so-called Darwin or other theory of Evolution of Man from the Ape, the Monkey or other lower Animal, in the public schools and Colleges or other institutions of the State supported or receiving support from the State.

"Section 2. Be it enacted by the authority aforesaid that any School, College or other institution violating the provisions of the preceding section shall not participate or share in the distribution of the Public School funds or any other fund or funds provided by the State.

"Section 3. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That all laws and parts of laws in conflict with this Act, be and the same are hereby repealed."

This bill was submitted to the Committee on Education, which by a unanimous vote (13 to 0) reported it favorably. However, it seems that it was never submitted to a vote of the House or the Senate. (This statement is based upon a reply to a letter of inquiry addressed to Mrs. Maud Barker Cobb, State Librarian.)

It will be noted that while Bryan's outcry was directed against "the teaching of *Darwinism* as a *fact*," the bill refers to the "so-called Darwin [*sic*] or other *theory* of evolution," and says nothing whatever about teaching anything "as a fact." This was true also in respect to the bills in Tennessee, Mississippi and Louisiana. The Commoner always deliberately referred to "Darwinism" as synonymous with "Evolution," and pretended that what he, as a Fundamentalist, objected to was "the teaching of the theory of evolution as a fact." It never seems to have occurred to Bryan that facts are always presented as facts, while the theory is advanced as accounting for the facts.

On July 29, 1925, an amendment to the General Ap-

propriation Bill, designed to prohibit the teaching of evolution in the public schools of Georgia, was introduced in the State House of Representatives by Rep. Paul Lindsay, of De Kalb county. It was voted down overwhelmingly, the "noes" drowning out the "ayes." The amendment provided that any teacher who should be found guilty of teaching any theory of evolution or the creation of man in contradiction to the accounts given in Genesis should be discharged, and any school permitting such teaching should be denied any support from the state funds.

Speaking on behalf of his back-woods amendment, Lindsay said:

> "No man's education, no system of education that is founded on things other than the fundamentals of Holy Writ, can endure. I don't want any smart Aleck trying to teach my child that man descended from a tadpole or a monkey. *My child shall not be subject to the inroads of scientists.* We must protect them from the *poison* that is being injected. When a man gets so smart that he can't believe the Bible he is just too smart to know that he's a fool."

At a recent Georgia Baptist Convention, the Rev. John D. Mell said (according to *The Savannah Press*): "If the Bible and the microscope do not agree, the microscope is wrong. I will believe the Bible if it makes every laboratory in the land a liar."

The Rev. Dr. Marion McH. Hull was reported by *The Atlanta Journal* as saying: "If the scientists want to test the truth of any theory, they should search the Scriptures, and if the theory and the Bible do not conform, the theory should be rejected."

The Rev. Dr. F. C. McConnell, pastor of the Druid

Hills Baptist Church, Atlanta, himself admits that "the Baptist ministry contains the most scholarly group of men to be found anywhere." The above quotations are offered in evidence.

A very clear idea of Fundamentalist culture may be derived from an item which appeared in the press of Georgia and elsewhere. A few years ago there occurred a debate in the General Assembly on a measure to allow counties, school districts or municipalities to establish and maintain public libraries, either by donations or by taxation. The bill had been favorably reported, but was defeated by a vote of 63 to 57. Why?

Rep. Hal Kimberley, of Laurins county, answered this question in a very few words. According to this disciple of the late Bryan, there are only three books in the world worth reading—the Bible, the hymn-book, and the almanac.

> "These three are enough for anyone. Read the Bible. It teaches you how to act. Read the hymn-book. It contains the finest poetry ever written. Read the almanac. It shows you how to figure out what the weather will be. There isn't another book that [it] is necessary for anyone to read, and therefore I am opposed to all libraries."

Mr. Bryan had already informed the people of Georgia that "in one chapter Moses gives us three verses that more vitally concern man than all that can be found in the books that uninspired man has written."

The orthodox Mohammedan would agree with Mr. Kimberley and Mr. Bryan. "If it's worth knowing, it is in the Koran. If it isn't in the Koran, it isn't worth knowing. Burn it!" (As a matter of fact, the Moslems of

Egypt are in the throes of a Fundamentalist" battle, too, burning the books of "Modernist" Dr. T. E. Hussein, the blind professor of Arabic literature in the State University at Cairo.)

In connection with this county library bill, a statement was erroneously published that the Georgia Legislature had held up an appropriation for maintenance of the state library on the ground that books on evolution might be found there. This was not so. The chief librarian, Mrs. Maud Barker Cobb, has been in charge of this library for many years, and is given entire freedom in her choice of books. The question of evolution has not come up in this connection.

It should be stated that Georgia now has a number of liberal newspapers which have fought anti-evolution propaganda valiantly. Prominent among them is *The Columbus Enquirer-Sun,* edited by Mr. and Mrs. Julian Harris (son and daughter-in-law of Joel Chandler Harris), who won one of the Pulitzer prizes in 1926. It was very largely due to the brave and unselfish labors of these two brilliant journalists that the anti-evolution bills went down to defeat. When Mr. Harris bought *The Enquirer-Sun* in 1921, he decided that he would publish a daily that would stand against race-prejudice, religious intolerance, and the Ku Klux Klan, and that he "would expose the ulcerated State politics and politicians, and do more than his share in saving education from the Fundamentalists and crooked politicians," says Thomas Boyd (*The Forum,* July, 1926). Mr. Boyd tells us further that:

"The very next morning after thirteen members of the Educational Committee of the Georgia House of Representatives

had unanimously recommended the passage of a bill to prohibit the teaching of evolution in the schools, Mr. Harris struck at these 'Thirteen Little King Canutes.' After stating the case he said, 'If the Georgia Legislature accepts the report of the House Committee on education, the theory of evolution will stand just where it is to-day. But the State of Georgia,—the State which for so many years was the home of the great Le Conte who contributed so largely to confirming the theory of evolution,—will be used as a synonym for unenlightenment and backwardness.

" 'The passage of this narrow and archaic bill will be a death-blow to all the State educational institutions, for no intelligent young man will wish to attend a college or a technical university where the integrity of scientific education has been destroyed by the State itself. For the prospective student will sense the fact that when the teaching of the theory of evolution is barred, biological chemistry goes by the board, and geology, zoology, and psychology must follow along with the discontinuance of study of language and its origin. . . . History repeats itself, and so to-day in Georgia thirteen midget-minded imitators of King Canute are sitting on the sands of Ignorance at the edge of the great ocean of Truth, ordering the tides of knowledge to recede.' This editorial was reprinted by many other Georgia newspapers. The anti-evolution bill went down defeated,—in a State which tops the list for illiteracy!

"And a year later when the contending liberal and Fundamentalist forces were gathered at Dayton, Tennessee, for the trial of John Thomas Scopes, *The Enquirer-Sun* was the only Georgia newspaper represented. Mr. Harris had borrowed the money for the trip; with his wife, Julia Collier Harris, who had worked by his side against ignorance, bigotry, intolerance, and graft, he sent back crushing arguments against the Bryan-championed zealots. By this time he had regained most of the circulation which *The Enquirer-Sun* had lost in driving the Klan out of Columbus; but now several hundred more of his subscribers left him. That was not unexpected. He knew that while a poor newspaper is made by its public, a good newspaper makes its public."

It should be mentioned by way of parenthesis that Prof. Robert Preston Brooks, head of the department of economics and Dean of the School of Commerce at the University of Georgia, states (*The Forum*, November, 1926, page 754) that, in total illiteracy, five states, four of them southern, "are in worse condition; and in white illiteracy eight states, all southern but one, fall below Georgia." He further points out that education in Georgia is now forging steadily ahead, and that the Ku Klux Klan is no longer dominant in politics, as shown in the defeat of Klan candidates at the last election: "Indeed, in all the major contests the Klansmen and those reputed to be Klan sympathizers appear to have been overwhelmingly defeated." He confirms the statement of Carl Van Doren, who, in a visit to Georgia in 1925, found that the youth of the state "is keen-minded, and the state university is one of the most enlightened schools in the country, with great possibilities of reaching the top in the world of learning, if it is not hampered by politics and lack of funds." Professor Brooks avers that the promotion of Dr. Charles M. Snelling, for many years Dean of the university, to the Chancellorship was in no sense a political appointment. The Board of Trustees "appointed an able committee, headed by the Hon. Samuel H. Sibley, Judge of the Federal Court of the Northern District of Georgia, to bring in a nomination. This committee for two years made a nation-wide search for a suitable man," and finally named Dr. Snelling, "a choice which met the approval of the University community and of the alumni."

To continue the story of the work of the Harrises in behalf of liberalism and science:

While Mr. Harris was writing and publishing uncompromising editorials of protest against the Fundamentalist attack on freedom of teaching, Mrs. Harris was writing column after column of articles explaining the meaning of evolution and presenting the evidences upon which the theory of transformism is based. Fortunately for the cause of education, the majority of Georgia's legislators were (and are) on *The Enquirer-Sun's* mailing list, and the result was shown by the defeat of every anti-evolution measure that has so far come before the General Assembly.

One regrets to record that the teachers and college professors (of course with exceptions) cannot be said to have done their share in upholding their own cause.

And Mr. Harris did not hesitate to express editorially his disapproval of their silence. Said he:

> "Something is wrong somewhere when educators, the men and women who are supposed to be willing to sacrifice everything to their ideal of integrity of intellect, have no word in defense of learning. *The Enquirer-Sun* invites from any educacator in Columbus or elsewhere some word on this unusual condition, this amazing symptom—clear-eyed Knowledge apparently cringing at the misshapen feet of Ignorance." (quoted by Charles F. Pekor, Jr., in his informing article, "An Adventure in Georgia," *The American Mercury*, August, 1926).

Meanwhile, the Fundamentalist war on enlightenment continues unabated in the home state of Joseph Le Conte (in his day one of the nation's greatest exponents of evolutionary fact and theory), later claimed by the University of California as one of her most beloved adopted sons. How great would be his astonishment

were he alive to-day and found that in the beginning of the second quarter of the twentieth century, four Atlanta teachers and at least one University of Georgia professor had been singled out by a band of religious fanatics for dismissal from their positions for teaching a doctrine accepted as fully established in the opinion of experts, nearly half a century ago! And that nearly three years before this, the resignation of Dr. Henry Fox, professor of biology in Mercer University, was demanded because of his support of the theory of evolution!

Dr. Fox is a member in good standing of the Baptist Church, but refused the order of trustees that he teach evolution "the Baptist way"—which, it was explained, was to follow every statement concerning evolution with a reading from Genesis and the declaration that this was the true account! The student body threatened to strike, and adopted resolutions denouncing the trustees. Professor Fox refused to resign and was "indefinitely suspended," which brought the matter to a close. Dr. Rufus Weaver, the president of the university, is a liberal and protected Dr. Fox as long as he could. He is said to be protecting two other professors under suspicion for their belief in evolution, one of whom is, at this writing, contemplating resigning so as not to embarrass Dr. Weaver's administration further.

There being no session of the Legislature in Georgia in 1926, the Board of Education of Atlanta recently decided to anticipate the expected results from the activities of the Supreme Kingdom and the Bible Crusaders in 1927, and issued orders that no teaching of evolution would be tolerated by them in the

city's schools. (This order has since been rescinded.)

But there are many stirrings of revolt in Georgia. It is gratifying to note that *The Daily Telegraph*, of Macon, has opened its columns to a free discussion of the evolution question, and even allows the publication of letters attacking the infallibility of the Scriptures,—"and this, mind you," writes T. S. Wilson in *The Truth Seeker*, "in a land in which slavery was upheld by the teaching and preaching of the Bible."

A clergyman of Augusta was quoted by Prof. Edwin B. Linton (then of the University of Georgia Medical School) as declaring that anti-evolution legislation "is the product of an infantile view of science and a senile view of theology."

At the November, 1926, election, W. D. Upshaw, of Ku Klux persuasion, who was expected to assist Blanton, Blease and other Fundamentalist statesmen in framing a Federal anti-evolution law, was defeated in his effort to be re-elected as Congressman from the Fifth District by Leslie J. Steele, of Decatur. One notes also with gratification that the Fundamentalist Governor C. M. Walker (Baptist) has been succeeded by L. G. Hardman. It is certain that Walker was in thorough sympathy with the anti-evolution forces, whereas there may be a chance that Hardman would veto an anti-evolution measure. (It may be recalled that Governor Walker, in September, 1925, issued a proclamation appointing a "Prayer Day" for rain! He is said to have had the warm endorsement of Sam Small and many other Fundamentalist evangelists.)

But despite these certain evidences of intellectual awakening among the people of Georgia, this potentially

great state is still in danger of joining Tennessee, Mississippi and other southern commonwealths in outlawing the teaching of evolution.

FLORIDA

Repeated attempts have been made to enact laws in Florida to prevent any teaching in its state-supported schools which conflicts with Fundamentalist views of religion. As early as 1923 the following joint resolution, due to the activities of Bryan, was passed by the Florida Legislature:

"Whereas, the constitution of the State of Florida expressly states in section 6 of the Declaration of Rights that, 'No preference shall be given by law to any church, sect or mode of worship, and no money shall ever be taken from the public treasury directly or indirectly in aid of any church, sect or religious denomination, or in aid of any sectarian institution,' and

"Whereas, the public schools and colleges of this state, supported in whole or in part by public funds, should be kept free from any teachings designed to set up and promote sectarian views, and should also be equally free from teachings designed to attack the religious beliefs of the public, therefore

"Be it Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

"That it is the sense of the Legislature of the State of Florida that it is improper and subversive of the best interest of the people of this State for any professor, teacher or instructor in the public schools and colleges of this State, supported in whole or in part by public taxation, to teach or permit to be taught, Atheism or Agnosticism, or to teach as true Darwinism, or any other hypothesis that links man in blood relationship to any other form of life."

The practical effect of this joint resolution was to deny to the youth of Florida the opportunity to learn anything concerning the doctrine of evolution, making it quite impossible for any teacher to impart any true knowledge of geology, biology, sociology, and other sciences.

But fanaticism was not yet satisfied. It was insisted that the theory of evolution be formally outlawed. So on May 13, 1925, the House Committee on Education reported out a substitute bill modifying one submitted by Representatives McLean of Suwanee county and Phillips of Levy county. The bill as finally adopted read as follows:

"An Act prohibiting the teaching of the evolution theory in all the universities, normals and all other public schools of Florida, which are supported in whole or in part by the public school funds of the state, and to provide penalties for the violation thereof.

"Section 1. That it shall be unlawful for any teacher in any of the universities, normals and all other public schools of the state which are supported in whole or in part by the public school funds of the state, to teach any theory that denies the story of the divine creation of man, and to teach the theory of evolution of man from a lower order of animals.

"Section 2. That any teacher found guilty of a violation of this act shall be disqualified to teach in any of the public schools of the state and upon satisfactory evidence shall be discharged by the county board of public instruction, state board of education or any other employing agency.

"Section 3. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage and approval by the governor."

In the bill as originally drafted, the penalty provided would make any teacher found guilty liable to sus-

pension from teaching in all the schools of the state for a period of one year for the first conviction, and on second offense would disqualify him or her from teaching in Florida for all time.

No anti-evolution bill has as yet been discussed in the Senate, so far as I can learn.

With the aid of the Supreme Kingdom, the Ku Klux Klan and the Bible Crusaders (whose winter headquarters, it will be remembered, is in Florida), complete success in suppressing the boys' and girls' right to learn modern science is expected by the Knights of Darkness at the 1927 session of the Florida Legislature—an expectation which will probably be unrealized for a few years at least.

On May 13, 1926, the Rev. Dr. Len G. Broughton, of Jacksonville, classed as "humbuggery" all facts or theories which stand in opposition to the Hebraic creation-poems of antiquity. He told his fellow-Fundamentalists (at the seventeenth annual Southern Baptist Convention, held in Memphis) that scientists were "attempting to force the church to lay aside the Adam of Genesis, and accept the built-down man [a phrase which has become the stock-in-trade of all Fundamentalist orators] of the Metropolitan Museum, a skeleton ingeniously constructed by so-called scientists of bones of monkeys."

Needless to add, the delegates were much pleased by this knock-out blow to "science falsely so called"!

On June 6th, the Rev. Dr. Arthur G. Lyons, pastor of the Union Congregational Church of West Palm Beach, and president of the West Palm Beach Ministerial Association, was deposed from his presidential chair because,

in a baccalaureate address, he said that "the Darwinian theory opened up a new vista and pushed the view of the energies of God back 800,000,000 years." Discussing the resolutions thereupon adopted by the Ministerial Association, Dr. Lyons remarked that it was "not a question of evolution but a question of freedom of speech. No group has a right to dictate to me what subjects I may choose for a baccalaureate sermon."

ALABAMA

The point of view of the Alabama Fundamentalists was succinctly and definitively expressed by the Rev. Dr. Livingston T. Mays, pastor of the Citywide Baptist Church, of Montgomery, as reported in *The Montgomery Advertiser:*

> "It is the belief of true scholars that those who try to harmonize science and religion waste their time, for [the orthodox Christian] religion is true and the Bible is true, therefore scientific, and all genuine science accepts the Bible because every statement in it is absolutely true and therefore scientific. The Bible, notwithstanding all statements to the contrary, has not one solitary unscientific or untrue sentence in it."

This will be news to Biblical scholars.

In 1923 (late in July or early in August), State Senator Horton introduced an anti-evolution bill in the Alabama Legislature. In answer to a request for authentic information as to the fate of this measure, Grover C. Hall, the progressive editor of *The Montgomery Advertiser*, said (under date of December 6, 1926):

> "A pretty warm fight followed. The same bill was introduced in the House. Committees of both houses brought the bills out,

as I remember—anyway, there was a straight-out vote on the question in both houses. The Horton measure was defeated by a comfortable, but not overwhelming, vote in each house. There will be another effort to put such a bill over when our Legislature meets in January, but I think we can kill it, although our present Governor, Bibb Graves [Grand Cyclops of the Ku Klux Klan], would probably sign it if passed, and knowledge of that will make the Bryanites work all the more determinedly.

"My boast is this: We beat this bill in '23; every daily newspaper in the state, city daily and small daily also, opposed the bill, while the right to teach evolution has never been an issue in any college in Alabama—that is, not openly."

The following extract from *The Birmingham News* is typical of the attitude of the Alabama urban press in general on the question of freedom in teaching, and religious bigotry:

"Bigotry and ignorance have ever resented and resisted any advance, any growth, any discovery of truth. Scientific books have been burned and condemned by theologians since the earliest times. Nor have bigotry, ignorance and intolerance changed one whit from the days when *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* was first promulgated, through the Inquisition, in 1557, down to the present time. . . .

"The trouble about all this sort of legislation is that it is a manifestation of doctrinal interference in matters of state, a growing menace, and one which the founders of the republic feared deeply. From prohibiting the teaching of science in the schools it is but a step to the proscribing of other studies; and then next, the active teaching of religious dogma. And then the destruction of liberty and the republic will have been complete."

With a population of 2,500,000, Alabama has 1,100,000 church members—according to a report made at

the 1926 State Baptist Convention. There are a million residents of this state above nine years of age who are affiliated with no church. Most of the communicants are Baptists or Methodists, the majority of whom are Fundamentalists and anti-evolutionists. Many of them take advantage of the "Letters to the Editor" columns of the liberal *Montgomery Advertiser* to do propaganda for the Biblical creation stories as against the teachings of modern science. To explain the Bible in terms of modern thought is, for the Fundamentalist, to "destroy" it. A typical example of the method employed by these zealots to discredit man, his institutions, and his achievements, follows (September 4, 1926):

"The effort to destroy the Bible has failed in every instance. It manifests the possession of an imperishable Life. It is the only Book in the world that is truly hated [?]. . . .

"The natural explanation of this hatred is because it gives no praise to man and his world, but the reverse. It does not describe the progress of man as an effort against evil, neither does it flatter his wonderful civilization. But on the contrary, it says he is full of evil, fornication, wicked and covetous, murder and strife, hateful to God, unmerciful, etc., etc. . . .

"The democratic spirit in man to resist all authority but such as is self-imposed, is the cause of the efforts that have been made to destroy the Bible, and is the result of the lawless one, in 2 Thes. ii: 3-10. This is the main attempt in our day in the name of scholarship and too liberal theology. . . .

"Violence having failed, science and scholarship took up their persistent work against the Bible. Man's books against God's Book. Yet man's books die of themselves. . . .

"Though all the tenets of Satan have combined and brought misery and woe to the human family, and have denied from beginning to end the truths of the Bible, all this denial and

the apostasy of man has not brought one single indictment against the Bible. Even in this age of apostasy, it is evident that the absolute and divine accuracy of Scripture from beginning to end is more firmly grasped by those who know it best and adhere to its mandates, than any other age of the world.

"As good scholars and as accurate scientists as the world has produced find no conflict between the Bible and science. Science is continuously correcting her blunders; yet all the efforts of mankind fail to find a misstatement in the Bible."

Nearly every issue of *The Advertiser* contains one or more letters filled with such baldly false statements. But, on the other hand, the liberals of Alabama do not fail to send in crushing replies to the anti-evolutionist detractors of the human race. Dr. Dillon J. Spotswood, of Mobile, in particular, never allows a false statement concerning either the Bible or evolution to go unchallenged; and his replies consist almost wholly of citations of incontrovertible facts. Dr. Spotswood has also done valiant work in organizing Science Round Tables (clubs for discussion of scientific subjects) in Mobile and elsewhere in Alabama. W. C. Braxton, a scholarly resident of Evergreen, Dr. W. B. Palmer of Furman, and J. E. Harris, an able writer of Tallassee, besides a number of other well-informed persons in various parts of the state, also offer effective and conclusive replies to the ardent Fundamentalists.

On January 12, 1927, a ministerial representative named C. O. Thompson, of Etowah, introduced into the Alabama House a bill to prohibit the teaching of every theory of evolution that denies the divine creation of man, as taught in the Bible, and the teaching instead

that "man has descended from a lower order of animals." The penalty was to be a fine of from $100 to $500 for each offense.

An informal poll of the House showed that 80 out of 105 members were opposed to the bill, which promptly died in committee. As usual, *The Montgomery Advertiser* was foremost in the campaign which resulted in the Thompson Bill's demise.

With nearly every daily in the commonwealth opposed to interference with school affairs by sectarian religious groups, and the general common sense of the educated people of Alabama as a whole, the anti-evolutionists of this progressive state have a hard task before them. There is plenty of evidence, however, that they are "very much on the job."

VIRGINIA

While it would be very difficult at this time for even the valiant Bible Crusaders to force an anti-evolution bill through the legislature of the state of Jefferson and religious liberty, nevertheless, according to an Associated Press dispatch of August 12, 1925, dated from Richmond:

> "A committee has been formed here to support a bill at the next session of the Virginia General Assembly to forbid the teaching of any theory of the evolution of man 'in conflict with the Bible.'"

This committee was scheduled to meet in Richmond on August 29th, but evidently no action was taken on the proposal at that time.

A letter from the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America (published in *The Forum*) states that "the Virginia legislature had before it for a month an anti-evolution bill which was withdrawn in March" [1926]. But a letter of inquiry to the State Librarian of Virginia brought forth this reply:

"I wish to state that you have been misinformed. No anti-evolution bill was offered in our legislature at the last session of the legislature; nor is there any impending anti-evolution legislation in Virginia."

This reply, from H. R. McIlwaine, State Librarian, was dated April 20, 1926, at which time the bill referred to above was supposed to have been recently under consideration.

In his excellent article, "Virginia" (*The American Mercury*, November, 1926), Virginius Dabney throws light on the question of how it came to be reported that the legislators of this state had considered passing an anti-evolution law in the legislative session of 1926. Says Mr. Dabney:

"A Methodist clergyman in the Assembly announced his intention of sponsoring a bill outlawing the hideous and nefarious doctrine of evolution. He never introduced it, for he soon found on investigation that it was certain to be defeated. . . . With teachers in North Carolina continually belabored by earnest pastors who adhere to the doctrines of Bryanism, and with Tennessee and Mississippi already committed to the literal interpretation of Genesis, educators in Virginia are free to embrace Darwinism, and they do not hesitate to do so, even in the sectarian institutions. Anyone who attempts to hamper scientific research by an appeal to Scripture receives only loud guffaws and is speedily laughed out of court."

On October 8, 1926, the foreign mission board of the Southern Baptist Convention, meeting in Richmond, adopted a resolution rejecting any theory which teaches that man originated by way of a lower animal ancestry. The resolution said that the board accepted the action taken by the Southern Baptist Convention in Houston, Texas, in May, which was that:

"This convention accepts Genesis as teaching that man was the special creation of God, and rejects every theory, evolution or otherwise, that teaches that man originated in or came by way of a lower animal ancestry."

Luckily for Virginia, resolutions are harmless.

WEST VIRGINIA

The organized political crusade against the teaching of evolution in West Virginia was inaugurated in September, 1922, when the West Virginia Conference of the United Brethren of Christ "Resolved, that we pledge our support only to such candidates for the legislature as will vote against the use of text-books on Darwinism." The Brethren further expressed their hearty commendation of Bryan's "defense of the Bible," and their happiness "to note the sentiment that is being aroused against this vicious doctrine [evolution], and likewise the forces that are being marshalled for its overthrow." They were delighted to record that "the legislators of South Carolina a few months ago voted three to one to rid its schools of the curse of this groundwork of Modernism."

This action was taken as the result of the ludicrous attacks of Bryan on the results of modern scientific research. His foolish diatribes were publicly rebuked by

Dr. R. C. Spangler, of the University of West Virginia. Whereupon Colonel Bryan answered that he would forfeit the sum of one hundred dollars to any scientist who would publicly answer in the affirmative certain questions which the learned orator propounded, among which was the following:

"Are you willing to put in writing and sign a statement declaring that you believe you are the descendant of an ape?"

Since all the available evidence tends to prove that both man and the living anthropoid apes are descendants of a common simian ancestor of some millions of years ago, Dr. Spangler "signed on the dotted line," and claimed the $100. The thrifty Colonel had no alternative but to forward the pledged check, accompanied, however, by what he intended for an insulting note—both addressed in care of a third person.

The Rev. Fred W. Hagan, of Huntington, West Virginia, publicly expressed regret that Bryan had "not thought it wise to attend a school of religion and get posted on the modern viewpoint of the Bible," but preferred to undertake the salvation of "this degenerate generation by having the scientific views of the earlier Hebrew race taught in our public schools, and in all state colleges and universities."

As a result of the agitation of the Fundamentalists of the backward regions of the state, in April, 1923, the West Virginia Legislature was constrained to consider a bill which made it illegal to teach the theory of evolution in any public school or tax-supported college of the state. The half-educated persons behind the measure engaged the services of the eloquent, if not learned, Mr.

Bryan to help in "putting the law over." Appearing on the floor of the House, the aggrieved Commoner told the legislature that it was his purpose:

"To show how religious faith and Christian ideals are being undermined by teachers who believe that man is a descendant from the brutes and who, in our public schools and colleges, are substituting the Darwinian hypothesis for the Bible account of man's creation."

"The scientist must not be elevated above the minister," continued the celebrated anti-evolutionist. "The minister learns and teaches from the Book of Books, the scientist from nature." The Book and nature are both sources of truth, and since "all truth is of God," religion has no quarrel with "true science." But if the scientist derives from the Book of Nature conclusions antagonistic to the revelations of the Book of Books, then the scientist is wrong.

"Not one in ten of those who accept the Bible as the Word of God have ever believed in the evolutionary hypothesis as applied to man. Unless there is some rule by which a small fraction can compel the substitution of their views for the views entertained by the masses, evolution must stand condemned as contrary to the revealed will of God.

"But my purpose at this time is to show that science, as well as the Bible, condemns evolution. The evolutionists insist that the interpretation of the Bible should be determined by reason and not by popular vote of the Christians. For the sake of this argument, I will employ their logic and insist that science shall be interpreted by reason and not by popular vote of the scientists. If science is classifiable knowledge, then we are justified in rejecting as unscientific anything which is not established as true. On this ground, evolution should be rejected."

Somehow, a majority of the lawmakers present did not feel the force of this "argument" as they "should," and the anti-evolution bill was defeated "by popular vote" in the Legislature.

But proponents of the clay origin of man and rib origin of woman were not discouraged. On January 25, 1925, the Rev. J. M. Hays, representative from Gilmer county, introduced a bill "with teeth in it," in that it provided both a fine and imprisonment as a penalty for teaching any theory of the origin of man contrary to that contained in "the word of God." This bill, unfortunately, went a little too far, and was unfavorably reported by the Education Committee.

Nevertheless it was put on the calendar with an amendment making the penalty merely dismissal of the offending teacher. The bill was advanced to the third reading, but had not yet reached that reading when the Legislature adjourned. A similar bill was introduced in the Senate, but was never reported out by the Education Committee.

It was the avowed purpose of the combined Army of Reaction to see to it that a greater proportion of "real Christians" should be elected to the next State Legislature, who, knowing more about the Rock of Ages than the Age of Rocks, would vote for "the Bible account of man's creation."

The result of this carefully engineered election was that, at this writing, West Virginia is facing an anti-evolution bill, scheduled for consideration at the March (1927) session of the legislature.

The bill was preceded by a resolution, introduced by Delegate William A. Street, of Barbour county. On Jan-

uary 21, 1927, the House of Delegates voted, 57 to 36, against this resolution. Many of those voting "no," however, stated that they were anti-evolutionists, and were opposed to the resolution only because it could have no practical effect.

Accordingly, on January 24th, Mr. Street introduced House Bill No. 264, stating that "it shall be unlawful for anyone to teach the theory of Darwinism, Atheism or Agnosticism in the public schools of this state." The penalty was the teacher's dismissal.

I am indebted for this information to Warren R. West, of Clarksburg, a valiant champion of the cause of scientific freedom, who kindly sent me a copy of the bill which now menaces this state. Says Mr. West:

> "Anti-evolution legislation is not given much publicity in such states as West Virginia, but is quietly pushed through under cover. . . . The one trouble is that the press is muzzled. . . . Still, I am trying to make arrangements to challenge the author of this bill to defend his side of the question in the Charleston press."

MARYLAND

The anti-evolution wave has as yet hardly struck Maryland; but in May, 1925, Dr. Henry J. Delaney resigned as president and trustee of Goucher College (formerly the Baltimore College for Women, a Methodist institution), because Dr. Sturgiss Bell, instructor of Biblical literature, was not dismissed for "upholding the fundamentals of evolution."

The press of Maryland is all but unanimous in its condemnation of the efforts made in other southern states

for suppression of scientific facts and theories. *The Hagerstown Morning Herald* (June 6, 1925) speaks of this backward movement as "Bryanology." The Fundamentalist attacks on modern science as "science falsely so called" are characterized as being due to "the childishness of adults," presenting a real danger. To quote a paragraph in point:

"Bryanology is our topic. It is not a new science, or an old science, but a new name for an ancient mental malady. It might be called intellectual senility, but it would be much more appropriate to speak of it as cranial vacuity. It was once called noodleism. Mr. Bryan is right in believing the controversy over evolution is 'no joke,' but it has its comic aspects, and the most ludicrous feature of the uproarious 'revolt' is the appearance of Bryan in the rôle of a modern imitator of the cobbler who presumed to give advice on other subjects than shoemaking."

This paragraph is typical of the general attitude of the Maryland press during the Scopes trial, since which time evolution has been seldom referred to in the daily papers. It is significant that Dr. Wolfgang Koehler was invited to give his lectures on "The Intelligence of Apes" —on which subject Dr. Koehler is perhaps the world's leading authority—in the (Methodist) Goucher College as well as in Johns Hopkins University. On November 7, 1925, Universal Service sent over the wires the following dispatch:

"Baltimore Fundamentalists were much shocked to-day because Dr. Wolfgang Koehler, director of the Berlin Psychological Institute and of the Anthropoid Station at Teneriffe, Africa, is lecturing to colleges here, including Johns Hopkins and Goucher, with assertions that 'Man is only a higher type of anthropoid ape.'

"The Fundamentalists are chiefly shocked because he is proving his 'accusation.'

"To an audience of Hopkins civil engineering students, Dr. Koehler, speaking on the subject, 'The Intelligence of Apes,' said:

" 'My tests and years of study leave me no alternative but to assert that man is only a higher type of anthropoid, whose intelligence has undergone a great transformation through thousands of years of existence.' "

Had this statement been made in certain sections of the Union farther south, it is questionable whether Dr. Koehler would ever again have visited his Anthropoid Station at Teneriffe!

MISSOURI

The first personal political contest on the basis of Fundamentalism versus Modernism and Evolution occurred in April, 1926, when J. C. Maupin, one of the younger residents of Clarence, Shelby county, Missouri, defeated the Fundamentalist candidate, L. J. Peterman, a retired farmer, for the mayoralty of the progressive little town. According to *The New York Times* of April 4th, there was no opposition to Mr. Maupin until some of the religious bigots realized that while a student at William Jewell College (Baptist), at Liberty, Missouri, he had been among those who protested (in 1922) against the dismissal of Dr. Arthur Wakefield Slaten (now minister of the West Side Unitarian Church, New York City).

Mr. Peterman announced that he believed in the Bible "in just the way W. J. Bryan expressed it in the Dayton evolution trial." The people of Clarence, on April

6th, expressed instead a choice for Mr. Maupin, who declared that he believed in the Bible in the same way Dr. Slaten did in his capacity as professor of Biblical literature and religious training at William Jewell College.

Dr. Slaten had written a book on "What Jesus Taught," and was thereupon accused of heretical teachings. Brought to trial, he stated frankly that he did not believe in the resurrection of the body of Jesus, nor in "the power of Jesus to sit on the right hand of God and make intercession for mortals." He also denied the infallibility of the Bible, and repudiated the miraculous in general. His dismissal followed.

More recently, there occurred a somewhat serious disturbance at William Jewell College over an evolutionary biologist who frankly avowed his rejection of "the Virgin Mary story." It would seem that scientists are no longer permitted by the Fundamentalists to express their adherence to the doctrine of immutable law in the universe, but must tacitly admit the credibility of legendary miracles within the domain of biology, in order to hold their positions. The zoologist who is not ready to believe that parthenogenesis in human beings occurred at least once, is an "Atheist," and "not fit to teach our boys and girls."

The long-threatened war on evolution in Missouri has now begun in earnest. On June 26, 1926, Dr. James E. Congdon, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Kansas City, local leader of the Fundamentalists, began what is to be a state-wide assault on the teaching of evolution in the public schools and colleges. He said that he would "push to the limit" his anti-evolution cam-

paign. Dr. Congdon has already preferred charges against Farris H. Woods, instructor in biology in the Junior College of Kansas City. The Board of Education refused to act, seeing nothing in Dr. Congdon's assertions to get excited about.

Incidentally, it should be noted that the Armourdale Baptist Church of this same city expelled Chester J. Staton for praising Luther Burbank's religious views.

In answer to the inquiry of a news agency (1925), Gov. Sam A. Baker of Missouri declined to say whether he would or would not sign a measure prohibiting the teaching of evolution should one be enacted.

St. Louis is, as was previously stated, the headquarters of the National Anti-Evolution Society. Some idea of the power of the Fundamentalists in Missouri may be derived from what was said by the Rev. A. Northrop, a Kansas City minister, in addressing a Christian Endeavor meeting in Colorado: "Worse than an assassin who kills the body is he who shatters the faith of youth" —in which characterization he included the Modernist and the evolutionist. He went on to say that "rape fiends are burnt, but they are saints in comparison" with the teachers of modern evolutionary science! He was, of course, only following in the footsteps of Bryan, who at Dayton, on July 19, 1925, accused evolutionists of a conspiracy to wreck Christianity and education, charged them with dishonesty, and asserted that "they have a bloody purpose."

Dr. William B. Riley in 1925 told a Los Angeles daily that he intended to institute a test case in Missouri to determine "whether any kind of religion may be taught

in tax-supported schools"—evolution now being classed by Fundamentalists as a "religion"!

Inspection of a catalogue of the University of Missouri shows that the "religion" referred to includes the following:

"Biological factors in Social Evolution. A course on the biological basis of sociology. Among the topics treated will be the relation of organic to social evolution with special attention to heredity, selection, adaptation, and variation; the beginnings of social evolution in the animal world, and the instinctive, emotional and intellectual basis of association."

This highly interesting course is given by Prof. Charles A. Ellwood, widely known as the author of "Sociology and Modern Social Problems," "Christianity and Social Science," etc. Professor Ellwood has been the object of virulent attacks by the Fundamentalists, who are determined that he be driven from his chair. So far their efforts have been fruitless. It seems hardly likely that an anti-evolution bill can be forced through the State Legislature of Missouri, but this state has been singled out for an early "intensive attack."

It appears probable that the average voter of Missouri would resent any religious interference with the state university, of which the citizens are justly proud. Perhaps many of them would agree with *The Chicago Tribune* that:

"It is not that ignorance of the evolutionary theory means a great deal. Most people know very little about it. It is the ostrich posture which signifies a type of mind willfully ignorant in all things. An employer selecting among several

college graduate applicants is not likely to appreciate the back porch mental façade presented by the young man from the state college refusing to permit the teaching of evolution."

It is highly important that the fact be fully recognized that much harm to the educational system of this nation has been done, and is being done, by religious fanatics, quite apart from restrictive legislative action. Certain activities of Fundamentalists in Missouri will illustrate the manner in which educators are hampered in their work by itinerant preachers of the "Crusader" type.

Owing to its unquestioned excellence, Professor Ellwood's Sociology was strongly recommended by the public schools of a certain city in Missouri, and was subsequently adopted as a text-book by the high school. But along came a "Crusader," who delivered himself of an anti-evolution (i. e., pro-Genesaic) lecture in the high school. His attention was called to this thoroughly modern work by a pious sister, and especially to the chapter dealing with Darwin's theory of evolution.

"He proceeded," says a correspondent who was on the spot, "to lay about him with the jawbone of an ass, with great industry and vehemence, and succeeded in working *hoi polloi* up to an indignant and righteous pitch that made the welkin ring."

The evangelist was later informed that the same ungodly superintendent had reviewed with his faculty, during a teachers' meeting, William J. Fielding's "Puzzle of Personality," and a copy of this excellent essay was also put into the hands of the Mosaic crusader.

"He denounced this book as indecent, outrageous, and proceeded to add to the general hilarity of the occasion with a series of rantings, swearing eternal allegiance to the story of creation as told in Genesis, i. e., one of them, I do not know which one. When he left town he allowed his mantle to fall on the shoulders of one of the local pastors, who has kept the home fires burning, in anticipation of what awaits the evolutionists in the sweet bye-and-bye."

The sequel to this story is that, although the thoroughly competent and well-liked superintendent was reemployed by the board of education the following March, the Crusaders made a political issue of the matter, carried the spring election, and voted down the tax levies. The superintendent was then presented with a petition in which his resignation was requested, along with the statement that no tax levy would be voted until his resignation was in the hands of the board of education. Forced to choose between the good of the community and the welfare of his own family, the superintendent resigned.

Another correspondent writes:

"We rather expect that a very serious attempt will be made in the next Missouri Legislature to prohibit the teaching of evolution in the tax-supported schools of the state. If this is not a cause of great human importance, when scientific facts cannot be taught and when teachers of science are not free to teach scientific facts, I do not know one which is."

So far as the social sciences are concerned, the fight centers about Professor Ellwood and his books, most of the writers of public school text-books on sociology discreetly omitting references to evolution in their texts,

though they are themselves evolutionists—a safe and sane if not wholly candid policy.

The following editorial, which appeared in an organ of the Scottish Rite Masons, shows that the impending battle in Missouri on the question of evolution will by no means be a one-sided affair:

"Missouri has been selected by the Fundamentalists as the scene of a test case, which will try to exclude evolution from the schools on the unique ground that it 'is a religion'! This statement has appeared in the press and demands the serious consideration of all Scottish Rite Masons, pledged as we are to freedom of thought and freedom of speech. We are also informed that a bill similar to that passed in the state of Mississippi is to be introduced into our next General Assembly. If passed, this bill will practically make impossible the teaching of modern science in our public schools. It will cripple at least six of the scientific departments of our state university. It will put Missouri in the list of backward states in respect to everything which may be called culture. It would destroy for a quarter of a century whatever leadership Missouri may have attained in education and science.

"Of course, it is not true that evolution is a religion. Evolution is simply a way of looking at nature which has been forced upon scientific men through scientific research and investigation. It is the view of the universe and of everything in the universe as in a process of development. It finds, therefore, that all life is related. . . . Universal evolution is accepted as a fact by all scientific men, but few profess to know its cause, or even the details of its methods. . . . The anti-evolutionists are not only seeking to destroy science, which is but another name for established truth, but also to destroy rational religion (which they confuse with mediaeval theology).

"Many teachers in Missouri have already suffered for conscience' sake and have been turned out of positions because they would not pledge themselves to refrain from teaching

the facts which have been discovered in connection with evolution. If Scottish Rite Masons are really in earnest in their pledge to support freedom of thought and freedom of speech, it is time that they pay attention to this matter and resist this new tyranny which threatens the integrity of our public school system."

The threatened bill arrived on January 18, 1927, under the joint sponsorship of Reps. C. C. Jackson of Oregon county and S. D. MacDaniel of McDonald county, both farmers. As originally written it condemned "the teaching of any theory or hypothesis in regard to the origin of life on this planet in the public schools that is contradictory of the divine account of creation as set forth in the first and second chapters of Genesis in the Holy Bible."

The bill when first read was "greeted with laughter" by almost all the House. However, many of the legislators stopped laughing when the time came to vote.

The committee on education recommended passage of the bill, but amended it so as to take out the reference to the Bible and forbade instead the teaching of "any theory or hypothesis that man descended from a lower order of animals." The penalty remained as before, $50 to $100 fine and forfeiture of the teacher's contract. Dr. A. H. Baldwin, representative from Cass county, spoke against the bill in committee and asked that the text-books be examined to see to what extent evolution was being taught in Missouri schools. This suggestion garnered only one vote in its favor. Rep. Perry S. Rader, historian, and official reporter of the Missouri Supreme Court, also opposed the bill; and outside the committee hearing there was active protest from liberal ministers

and laymen, from Pres. S. D. Brooks of the University of Missouri, from the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors, and from many newspapers, including *The St. Louis Post-Dispatch* and *Globe-Democrat,* and *The St. Joseph News-Press.* The protest brief sent in all such cases by the Science League of America is also credited with influence against the bill.

On February 5th the hearing was held before the House, and it was a lively one, with a live monkey introduced as an object-lesson! Facetious amendments were offered by several urban legislators, including one suggesting that the penalty should be imprisonment "for not less than thirty days nor more than forty nights in the St. Louis Zoo"; one that the bill should apply only to communities a majority of whose citizens believed that the world is flat, "that the sun travels around the earth, that the storms of the sea are caused by the fury of the monsters of the deep, that the gleam from the evil eye of the basilisk is the power of death," etc.; and one postponing enactment of the bill until 2000 A. D.

However, the bill came perilously near to passage. The final vote was 82 to 62. In 1929 a sadly different story may be told.

ARKANSAS

During the summer of 1926 it became apparent that a determined effort would be made to induce the 1927 General Assembly of the state of Arkansas to enact a law prohibiting the teaching of evolution in tax-supported schools and colleges of that state.

It was the Rev. E. E. Tull, of Pine Bluff, Arkansas,

who introduced the anti-evolution resolution at the Southern Baptist Convention, held at Houston, Texas, in May, 1926. The resolution, which was unanimously adopted ("the 'ayes' were like a storm; this is the third time for this convention to declare in unequivocal terms that it does not accept evolution at all"), follows:

"Whereas, the Southern Baptist Convention, in its session May 12, 1926, by unanimous vote, declared that it 'accepts Genesis as teaching that man was the special creation of God, and rejects every theory, evolution and other, which teaches that man originated in, or came out of, a lower animal ancestry'; and,

"Whereas, Our great school of the prophets, the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, through its board of trustees, on May 12th, accepted and incorporated the said action of the Convention in its Statement of Faith, and through its honored president so announced to this Convention on May 13th, and said president further announced that said Statement of Faith would be made a test of all officers and teachers of said seminary;

"Therefore, The Southern Baptist Convention does now resolve that it commends the Board of Trustees of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary for its prompt and hearty acceptance of the Convention's action; and, in order that no unfair comparisons arise or unjust accusations be brought against any of our Seminaries, schools or other Convention agencies, be it further

"Resolved, That this Convention request all its institutions and boards, and their missionary representatives, to give like assurance to the Convention, and to our Baptist brotherhood in general, of a hearty and individual acceptance of the said action of the Convention to the end that the great cause of our present unrest and agitation over the Evolution question be effectively and finally removed in the minds of the constituency of this Convention and all others concerned."

Arkansas Lutherans are even more reactionary, if such a thing be possible, than the Baptists and Methodists of the state. Their chief spokesman, the Rev. Earl Kretzschmar, of Fort Smith, regards liberalism and the doctrine of evolution as the source of all modern evils. In a recent address he said:

"Liberalism wrecked Eden's happiness and perfection; it condemned Jesus to the death on the cross; it fought the spread of Christianity from the start. Less than 400 years after the first Pentecost, liberalism nearly succeeded in destroying the soul of Christianity. It came down like a blight on the fruits of the Reformation; it has caused in part the large number of divisions by which the visible church is rent. It is the source of present-day crime waves."

James D. Bernard, in his valuable article on "The Baptists" (*The American Mercury*, February, 1926), has preserved for posterity a resolution by an Arkansas Baptist congregation which is typical of one hundred per cent. of the Fundamentalists of Arkansas, whatever their denominational affiliations:

"Be it Resolved, That it is the sentiment of Spring Creek Missionary Baptist Church of Benton, Arkansas:

"1st. That we take a positive stand against evolution as taught by Darwin as being dangerous, atheistic and contradictory to the teaching of the Bible, and that such a theory is considered by us to be dangerous, deceptive, and destructive to the cause of Christianity.

"2nd. That we endorse the action of the Tennessee legislature in passing the anti-evolution law.

"3rd. That we as a church stand against the fatal teaching of evolution, and that henceforth we will not endorse nor support any organization or institution that refuses to take a positive stand against evolution.

"4th. That we will continue to carry on the fight led by W. J. Bryan, and that we will not vote for any legislator or State senator who will not obligate himself to have enacted a law to prohibit the teaching of evolution in any common school, college or university supported by taxation in this State, nor do we favor the adoption of such books to be used in said schools that teach such theories as evolution, nor do we favor the employment of teachers who *believe* in the theory of Darwinian evolution in this State."

Let no reader be misled by the phrase "theory of *Darwinian* evolution," either in this resolution or elsewhere. No form or conception of the theory of evolution would be in the slightest degree acceptable to any Fundamentalist anywhere. Their well-worn phrase, "the teaching of the theory of evolution as a fact," does not by any means carry the implication that the teaching of evolution merely "as a theory" would be tolerated. This is pure hypocrisy or deliberate dissimulation. Wherever these fanatics gain a stronghold, the subterfuge is at once dropped, and the application of any teacher who even admits that he or she *believes in the theory* of evolution is immediately rejected. The Tennessee law, for example, prohibits the teaching of evolution not only "as a fact," but even as a theory—and "theory" to the Fundamentalist (as has been remarked) is synonymous with "guess" or "mere opinion."

In her very interesting interview with Bryan, Doris Stevens gives a conversation which illustrates this contention:

" 'But this Tennessee law,' I ventured, 'prevents the teaching of evolution as a theory, not as a fact. You do not, then, approve of this bill?'

" 'I wish you would not stress this point. I would not have the people think I did not support this law. They may be right. It might be very difficult to allow the theory to be taught, and it might be just as harmful.' "

Reverting to the situation in Arkansas, let me emphasize that not all the clergymen of this state (as of any other) are Fundamentalists or anti-evolutionists. At a meeting of Modernist ministers in Little Rock a resolution was passed openly opposing any attempt to throttle freedom of teaching in the state's educational institutions. And many of the faculty of the state university are holding aloft the torch of enlightenment, that its light may shine before the men and women of a greater Arkansas that is some day to be. It is gratifying to learn that Dr. J. H. Reynolds, president of Hendrix College, a Methodist Institution at Conway, has spoken publicly against legislative interference with the teaching of science, addressing audiences in both Little Rock and Helena, and, says Prof. A. D. McNair of the University of Arkansas, "he can be counted on to work against such legislation."

On the other hand, the Baptist College, at Little Rock, is reported as having required every member of the faculty to sign a "pledge and confession of faith," reading in part as follows:

"I do not believe in Darwinian evolution or materialistic, atheistic or theistic or any other theory of evolution by whatever name called which proposes to teach that there is, or has been, such a thing in nature as transmutation of species, or the evolution of life from one species to another, or that man came from the anthropoid ape, or from any lower form of animal life, or that man is derived from a common ancestor

with other so-called primates. I believe that man is the direct creation of God and not the product of some form of evolved life."

The Little Rock Science Club, of which Professor McNair was one of the founders, and in which the Rev. Hay Watson Smith is an active worker, is holding public meetings for the discussion, among other topics, of the proposed anti-evolution law. The club was recently addressed by A. L. Rotenberry, of Little Rock, one of the new representatives-elect to the Legislature, and an avowed anti-evolutionist. It was announced in *The Arkansas Gazette*, of Little Rock, that Mr. Rotenberry would introduce an anti-evolution bill in the next Legislature. Needless to say, he has had no training in any department of science. For him the Bible is the only true text-book on questions of man's origin and destiny.

All three Little Rock papers are opposing the proposed law to hamper the teaching of science, and such legislation is certain to meet with the disapproval of Judge John E. Martineau, Governor-elect.

Science Service states (*Science*, November 26, 1926) that the bill as it has been drawn is short.

"The chief paragraph is to the effect that 'it shall be unlawful to teach in any educational institution supported wholly or in part by public funds, any theory contrary to the Biblical story of the creation of man, or that man has descended from any species of lower animal.' Organization of the anti-evolution forces in the state is being perfected in preparation for the coming legislative conflict."

During September, 1926, a petition was published in the Arkansas press signed by prominent laymen as well

as clergymen, with the announcement that it would be presented to the Legislature when it met in regular session, January 1, 1927. It was first given publicity by *The Pocohantas Star-Herald,* and was reported to *Science* (October 8, 1926) by C. Bush, of Alicia. It reads as follows:

"To the Forty-Sixth General Assembly of the state of Arkansas: We, the undersigned citizens, voters and taxpayers of the State of Arkansas and County of Randolph, believing in the Mosaic account of Creation, and believing the Darwinian theory of the origin of man to be erroneous, false, and misleading, and calculated in its nature to lead men from the truth of God and to instill in them the spirit of infidelity;

"Do therefore, petition your honorable body to enact a law, similar to the 'Tennessee Anti-Evolution Law,' with just such changes and modifications as will make it applicable to the state of Arkansas.

"Explanation

"We believe in Evolution just as far as it goes; we believe in Evolution in the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms.

"We believe Evolution has produced changes in the earth. Its influence is recognized in the development of machinery and in the formation of languages and of governments. It produces many varieties of beautiful and useful things as flowers, apples, etc., hogs, sheep, cattle, etc. It has no doubt produced varieties of men and of monkeys, but we do not believe that any process of Evolution whatever can produce an apple tree from a mustard seed, a milk cow from a bullfrog, or a man from a monkey. Such a belief not only disputes reason and science, but it disputes the decrees of the Most High as recorded by His servant, Moses, in Genesis i: 11, i: 24, i: 26.

"We ask *The Star-Herald* and its exchanges to give this petition publicity. To afford ample notice, we ask all publishers in the state to publish this, however it may come to their

notice. We hope that the citizens of every county of the state will petition their representatives to support this measure."

The signers include the county school superintendent. The name of ex-Gov. Tom J. Terrell does not appear on the petition, since he is not a resident of this county, but it is well known that the Free Will Baptists (to which sect he belongs) are ardent advocates of anti-evolution legislation, and his support would undoubtedly have been thrown on the side of reaction, had he not been defeated for re-election, on October 5, 1926, by Judge Martineau.

Professor A. D. McNair informs me that Judge Martineau is "a man of education and culture and sound judgment," and he feels certain that:

"There is an eighty per cent. chance that he would veto an anti-evolution bill. He is the first Governor of Arkansas who is a graduate of the University of Arkansas. . . . There is a strong tendency here to avoid any mention of the subject of evolution in conversation or in the press. Even those who believe in evolution seem to think that the agitation will soon blow over and that the less said about it the better. Whether this is their real opinion or an attitude of fear that their jobs may be in danger if they say much about it I do not know."

Since the receipt of Professor McNair's letter, conditions have somewhat changed. A number of prominent citizens of Arkansas are now giving public expression to their convictions, and, as previously stated, the press of Little Rock at least is unanimously against the enactment of an anti-evolution law.

However, it is fully recognized by the better educated citizens that freedom of teaching in Arkansas is in grave

peril: how great may be seen by the events of 1927, to be described. Clay Fulks, a native of Arkansas, and until recently a school teacher in the state, says (*The American Mercury*, July, 1926):

"It will be astonishing if the bill does not pass; astonishing, too, if a single professor cheeps a word of protest against it. [As we have seen, this is not strictly true.] . . .

"Notwithstanding that the Fundamentalist is not peculiar to Arkansas, the most cursory survey of the present state of her civilization should include a note upon that primitive survival. Scientifically considered, I suppose, the true Fundamentalist is a person whose mental development has been arrested. His average mental age is perhaps as high as thirteen years. [Note the numerous "child evangelists" of that age.] He can weigh a sack of cotton, count money, and read the clock. Generally speaking, he is a farmer, workingman, or tradesman, who renders some more or less useful service to society and, to that extent, is a help rather than a handicap to civilization. But his contribution to *Kultur* is utterly and incontestably nothing. On the contrary, he adds immeasurable difficulties to the work of enlightenment and lowers the general average of intelligence appallingly. To the social scientist he is a baffling problem.

"But the lay Fundamentalist would remain a quiet, harmless nitwit, a producer of raw material or a useful artisan, were it not for the pragmatical parsons infesting the Arkansas region. These busybodies . . . incite him continuously against intelligence, wherever it shows its head. Let a man in any way dependent on the favor of the public express a rational opinion regarding Fundamentalism and its hideous consequences, and promptly these parsons and their accomplices begin to plot his ruin. . . . These parsons and their devotees suppress all sprouting ideas so successfully that we Arkansans, I fear, appear to be quite unanimous in our imbecility."

From what has been said, it may be that Mr. Fulks is

somewhat too pessimistic; for it is quite certain that Arkansas may justly boast of a number of persons, clerical, lay, and pedagogical, who are determined that the state of their birth or adoption shall not be Tennesseeized without a vigorous opposition. Conferences were being held early in October, 1926, having in view the development of a strong resistance to Fundamentalist encroachments on the educational field.

On January 13th (1927) the Rotenberry bill was introduced, and referred to the educational committee, which reported it unfavorably (this should be noted in view of what followed), by a large majority. However, the House held a public hearing on February 9th, and after several hours' discussion the vote was called for. It was 48 for the bill and 49 against it—a majority of one! Then Rep. Arthur Jones of Little Rock changed his vote to "yes" and another member did the same, thus giving the bill a majority of three. The House cheered.

The bill was then submitted to the Senate, on February 10th. It is stated on excellent authority that at one time the bill had a majority of four or five in the Senate, as shown by an informal count. However, the Senators were "strongly disinclined to a roll-call" and to thus "letting the public know where they stood"; and on the second reading the bill was tabled by an overwhelming *viva voce* vote.

Senator Richardson, of Hoxie, gave notice that he would ask for reconsideration; but Lieutenant-Governor Parnell, as presiding officer, ruled him out of order, since no record vote had been taken and it could not therefore be known how Richardson himself voted. However, on February 15th a motion was made to lift the

bill from the table. This was defeated by a vote of 17 to 14.

Rev. Ben M. Bogard, leader of the anti-evolution lobby, and a Baptist minister, expressed the chagrin of the defeated Fundamentalists when he announced (according to an editorial in *The El Paso Times*) "that every member of the legislature who voted against the anti-evolution bill will be 'black-listed' and that in subsequent elections the stand on evolution of every candidate 'from constable to governor' will be made the chief issue." Considering the narrow escape which Arkansas had in 1927, this augurs ill for 1929.

The bill was an unusually severe one. The penalty provided was a fine of from $200 to $1000, with revocation of the teaching license; and each day "said section" was violated was to constitute a separate offense!

Much of the credit for the victory in Arkansas belongs to Dr. Hay Watson Smith, the liberal Presbyterian minister of Little Rock, who worked indefatigably against the bill in every way; among other methods preparing a booklet, showing that every scientist of note is an evolutionist, which he distributed to all the legislators.

TEXAS

The crusade against freedom of teaching in the Lone Star State has furnished valuable lessons in tactics for "Defenders of the Faith" throughout the Union.

For four or five years now the numerous "old time" evangelists who find in Texas a happy hunting ground have been selling anti-evolution propaganda along with the traditional hell-fire and brimstone type of theology.

Under the inspiration of the voluble Bryan, and the pugnacious Fundamentalist preacher J. Frank Norris, "House Bill No. 97" was drawn up as early as 1923. This bill prohibited the teaching of evolution in any of its phases in the public schools or any of the higher educational institutions "supported in whole or in part by taxation." The bill, which was reported favorably by the Committee on Educational Affairs, also prohibited the members of the State Text-Book Commission from recommending or adopting any text-book which teaches the theory of evolution, either directly or indirectly. On March 9, 1923, the bill was passed in the lower house by a vote of 71 to 34. In the Senate the measure was favorably reported but "died on the calendar."

On February 5, 1925, "House Bill No. 378," similar to that of 1923, was introduced, referred to the committee, and favorably reported on February 9th. Contrary to widely current statements—one of which was that the bill was carried by a vote of 81 to 9—the bill "never got further along than this favorable report." This information comes from the House Journal of the Thirty-ninth Legislature, 1925, kindly supplied me by Raymond Gerhardt, of the Legislative Reference Division. During its career, an invitation was issued by the House to the Rev. Dr. J. Frank Norris to appear before them and speak upon the subject. Dr. Norris called evolution "the most damnable doctrine that has come out of the bottomless pit." He said further:

"So far as I am concerned, so help me God, I will not be a party to wink at, support, or even remain silent when any group, clique, crowd or machine undertakes to ram down the throats of Southern Baptists that hell-born, Bible-destroying,

deity-of-Christ-denying, German [!] rationalism known as evolution."

(This is the same divine who, in 1912, was indicted at Fort Worth for perjury and arson in connection with the burning of his then "outgrown" church—Dr. Norris demanding that a new and bigger "tabernacle" be built for him. On July 17, 1926, this anti-evolutionist confidant of the late Mr. Bryan sent three bullets into the body of D. E. Chipps, an unarmed man who had gone into the church study to dissuade Norris from continuing his vicious attacks on certain friends of Chipps. The text of Norris' sermon the next day was: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" [Rom. viii: 1].)

While it is more than likely that further attempts to outlaw the teaching of evolution in Texas by act of the legislature will be made, the Fundamentalists of this vast state have discovered a new method of suppressing all knowledge which is in contradiction to their cherished dogmas. Instead of awaiting the hour when evolution can be banned by statute, they have adopted a more direct and speedy method of suppressing facts, without consent of the people's representatives in the legislature. All that is required is a Fundamentalist governor and a majority of "true believers" on the State Text-Book Commission, supplemented by a blue pencil or a pair of scissors. Publishers are then called upon to omit the anti-Genesaic statements. Says *The Literary Digest:*

"Among the publishing firms which are deleting their textbooks are Henry Holt & Co., the Macmillan Co.; and the company of Allyn and Bacon, according to Charles E. Bacon,

senior member of that firm, 'made an agreement with the committee that we would permit modifications in the text if requested, or if we felt that the demands were too radical that we would give up our contract and withdraw the contract.'

"In one of the books in which revision was made, . . . wherever the word 'evolution' occurs, 'development' has been substituted. A chart . . . depicting man as the fruit of an immense evolutionary tree at the roots of which were shown the protoplasmic forms of life, has also been deleted."

Even the word "evolution" is taboo. One devout member of the commission demanded that the word be taken from the dictionary, but it was finally decided that the dictionary is not a state text-book in the accepted meaning of that term!

Several chapters from Prof. Truman Moon's "Biology for Beginners" (Henry Holt & Co.) were eliminated. Among the excised passages were:

"Evolution is a slow and gradual process."

"All forms are related by descent from common ancestors."

"It must be remembered that the upright position of man is an acquired position. A long time ago the ancestors of man climbed and walked on all fours."

"The group of primates includes the highest mammals, including monkey, gorilla, chimpanzee, orang-utan, gibbon, marmoset and lemur, as well as man himself."

"The theory of evolution as set forth by Darwin is the cornerstone of recent science and the foundation of all modern thought. In its broader features it is accepted by every biologist, although there are many details still to be worked out."

Even the conciliatory statement that there is no conflict "between science and religion" was stricken out:

"Evolution does not teach that God can be left out of the scheme of creation. Much opposition was made to Darwin's

work on this score by people who purposely or through ignorance misinterpreted his conclusions."

Changes were also made in "Healthful Living" (The Macmillan Co.), a text-book on physiology and hygiene, by Jessie Feiren Williams. In this book the statement that "the skeleton of man is the result of centuries of development" was altered to "the skeleton of the higher forms of animals represents many centuries of development."

In Gruenberg's "Biology and Human Life" (Ginn and Co.), a phrase concerning "some curious but useless relics" was changed to "some curious but useless structures." In another place "at last" was stricken out before "a four-chambered heart." The sentence, "mutations give rise to new species" was deleted.

Gov. Miriam A. Ferguson said concerning these excised statements: "I'm a Christian mother who believes Jesus Christ died to save humanity, and I am not going to let that kind of rot go into Texas text-books."

When questioned about the order of elimination of the theory of evolution from the text-books, Superintendent of Schools Marshall Johnston of San Antonio replied that "the old-time religion" was good enough for him. The editor of a magazine in Dallas, Richard Potts, writes that there had been no general demand on the part of the educated public for such a step; yet Mrs. Ferguson (whose fight for the governorship was warmly contested by the Fundamentalists only the year before) did exactly what they wanted.

"Not one teacher, not one politician, not one office-holder in Texas raised his voice against this infamous act of a set

of common politicians. Lacking organization, we remained quietly in our offices or in our homes, and allowed the fanatics to capture the public schools. We are a helpless, disorganized army, and as long as we continue to drag along as we have, we shall be defeated in every contest."

Attorney-General Dan Moody, who won the governorship of Texas over Mrs. Ferguson at the "run off" election by a majority of 200,000 votes, during an election speech made the following statement:

"I believe the Bible from cover to cover. I believe that God created man in His own image and likeness, that the whale swallowed Jonah, and that the children of Israel passed through the Red Sea on dry land."

With the learned Dan Moody in the gubernatorial chair, the foes of science in Texas need have no fear that an anti-evolution statute might be vetoed!

Little unfavorable comment on this mutilation of text-books to bring them into line with sectarian dogma appeared in the press of Texas. But *The El Paso Herald* made bold to declare that the action of the state school authorities in censoring science text-books

"is evidence of political cowardice and social irresponsibility in the face of the stupid fanaticism and the malice that always accompanies it. Young Texans, being wiser than their censors, are only rendered the more avid for knowledge of truth, and there are plenty of competent instructors to aid them. Progressive Texas fears no dark age and only asks that Texas clowns be not taken seriously."

Outside of Texas the action of the Texas authorities was either severely condemned or ridiculed. *The Providence Journal*, and several other papers, noted particu-

larly the false distinction made between "evolution" and "development." *The New York Times* made, among others, the following pertinent remarks:

"Texas has less excuse than some other southern states for trying to deny the pupils in its public schools knowledge of the truths and accepted theories that make up the modern science of biology. Neither its people nor their ancestors have been living isolated in mountain fastnesses where they had little opportunity to learn anything not known in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, or to unlearn anything then thought to be known. . . .

"This episode in Texas, with others like it, brings authors and publishers of school text-books face to face with a problem larger than the ordinary commercial adaptation of wares to meet the preferences of customers. Every authority on biology knows that to teach it with evolution left out is not to teach it at all."

The Crusaders' Champion assures the public that:

"The changes [in the text-books] were made, not because of any enmity for a scientific fact, but rather because a great group of citizens are not willing that theories, guesses, hypotheses, 'vain imaginings,' shall be palmed off on unsuspecting children as 'facts of science.' "

Of course a group of cross-road evangelists are more competent to judge of what are facts of science than are the members of the American Association for the Advancement of Science!

It would seem that only those teachers who are avowed Fundamentalists are desired as instructors in the natural sciences in the state's high schools. A church convention was told by a Texas clergyman that the higher schools are teaching "blasphemous, Bible-undermining, God-denying, Christ-cursing and faith-robbing evolu-

tion." His tirade was followed by an anti-evolution resolution, unanimously passed.

The University of Texas is constantly under fire because this "pernicious, atheistic doctrine" is not prohibited by the Regents. As a sop to the Fundamentalists, the university authorities have passed a resolution against the employment of anyone (presumably even a janitor!) who is known as a Freethinker.

"No infidel, Atheist or Agnostic shall be employed in any capacity in the University of Texas. . . . No person who does not believe in God as the Supreme Being and the Ruler of the Universe shall hereafter be employed."

At the present time, regularly appointed committees make periodical investigations of college class-rooms throughout the state, ever alert to ascertain if any doctrine contrary to "the word of God" is being taught. As a result of the organized power of Fundamentalist churches and "vigilance committees," several college professors (according to a United Press dispatch) have been forced to resign their positions, and "school teachers have been quietly ejected."

The one hundred per cent. Fundamentalist, J. Frank Norris, has "sworn to drive the theory of evolution out of church and public schools in all states, and is working for uniform legislation against it." It is acknowledged that largely through his efforts "six professors in southern colleges have lost their posts at various times because they displayed too great an interest in the subject of evolution." It was Norris who

"instituted the onslaught which led to the retirement of Dr. John A. Rice from Southern Methodist University because of

a book which brought to the south the more rudimentary facts of Biblical criticism; who worked assiduously to rid Baylor University of Dr. Henry Dow because his book on sociology mentioned evolution as a thing some people held [true]; who secured the dismissal of Instructor Fothergill from the same institution because an affidavit had been sworn to the effect that this instructor had been heard to teach evolution; and who earlier brought about the retirement of another professor [Slaten?] from William Jewell College and the Baptist Church because he taught certain philosophies not favorable to the production of acceptable evangelical graduates.

"Here is the true evangelical priest in action. And Norris is surely not alone. His imitators are abroad in the land, seeking whom they may devour. If they had their way every book suggesting the theory of evolution as an hypothesis would be burned in the streets. If they could achieve the control they seek, every scientific inquiry, every bit of experimentation, every venture into the unknown, every promulgation of ideas unpalatable to them would be halted, and the energy of the race directed solely toward evangelical theology." ("Gregory Hilton" [pseudonym of a Methodist minister], *The American Mercury*, June, 1926).

In June, 1925, Dr. M. T. Workman, professor of the English Bible at Southern Methodist University, Dallas, was discharged on the ground of "doctrinal irregularities in his teaching."

Some idea of the lengths to which such a preacher as Norris will go in order to entertain the type of auditors to which his "message" would naturally appeal may be gained from a letter from J. B. Galbraith, of Arlington, Texas, which was published in *The Truth Seeker* of August 22, 1925. To quote an illuminating paragraph:

"The Rev. J. Frank Norris, speaking to a large crowd here last night in a large circus tent, under which he has been conducting one of his great revivals, defined the theory of evolution for his audience, praised Bryan, and declared that he had accepted an invitation to meet Clarence Darrow in joint debate, and that if they could get Darrow to meet him he would skin the skunk's hide from him from one end of the country to the other. . . . He made the statement that a long husky Tennesseean walked up to Clarence Darrow on the platform in Dayton, stuck his fist in his face, and told him, 'Damn you, don't you reflect on my mother's Bible. If you do I will tear you in pieces.' Of course the crowd cheered Norris to the limit when he told this incident about this fine Christian hero!"

Needless to say, the anecdote is untrue. Evidently Norris, like many of his Fundamentalist brethren, believes with St. Paul, "For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto his glory; why yet am I also judged as a sinner?" (Romans iii: 7). Norris has been through a good many personal attacks, including charges of arson and murder, but he is still one of the monarchs of Fundamentalism in Texas.

On May 12, 1926, as noted in the section on Arkansas, the Southern Baptist Convention, assembled at Houston, outlawed evolution by two resolutions. It must be remembered, of course, that such actions as these by no means express the opinions of all the members of the denominations represented, either in the North or in the South. For example, it was ordered that the first of these resolutions be presented for signature to all the high officials and teachers of the denomination. When it was presented to Dr. S. P. Brooks, the efficient and suc-

cessful president of Baylor University, at Waco, Dr. Brooks said: "I would die and rot in my grave before I would sign the Houston resolution."

Texas, it appears, can boast of at least one prominent liberal in the Methodist Church, Bishop John M. Moore, of Dallas, who had the courage to say that "evolution is progress; Fundamentalism is fixity." But the vast mass of southern Fundamentalist ministers agrees with the Rev. W. A. Jarrell that:

> "God being the author of the Bible, common sense certainly assures us that *every* matter it contains, as originally written [?], is certainly as infallible as its author—whether on matters concerning science or any other."

James D. Bernard, who has made an exhaustive study of present-day religious sects, finds that:

> "All the denominational schools of the South are now undergoing examination as to their orthodoxy in the matter of evolution. The elders and deacons are busy rummaging through all the text-books and tearing out every page on which the slightest hint is given of the existence of an hypothesis of evolution or on which the names of such infidels as Darwin, Huxley or Haeckel are mentioned."

He calls attention to the fact that a resolution was recently adopted by the West Texas Methodist Conference calling upon Bishop James E. Dicky to appoint a committee of five to investigate the doctrinal teachings at the Southwestern University at Georgetown and the Southern Methodist University at Dallas (an unusually high-class institution). At this same conference the Rev. S. J. Johnston declared that "he had rather a boy of his was killed than that he should come back from college

filled with doubts as to the fundamentals of the Christian faith" (*The American Mercury*, April, 1926).

On May 27, 1926, the Fundamentalists of Texas were shocked by certain statements of experts in anthropology and medicine in convention assembled in Houston. To quote from a United News dispatch of that date:

> " 'Man once walked on four feet. He not only has evolved, but still is evolving.' More than one hundred noted surgeons, attending the annual convention of the Texas Medical Association, leaned forward in their seats when Dr. H. K. Aynesworth of Waco thus revived the old battle of science versus Fundamentalism.
>
> "Dr. Aynesworth then proceeded to offer what he declared was further proof of the soundness of the evolution theory, which was so scorchingly condemned here ten days ago by 10,000 southern Baptists in convention.
>
> " 'I don't care what the Fundamentalists say,' Dr. Aynesworth declared. 'Twenty per cent. of the human race have misplaced colons or large intestines. Man once walked on four feet, and in the process of straightening up, his large intestine was slow in adjusting itself to the erect position.'
>
> "Dr. A. B. Small, of Dallas, chairman of the meeting, emphasized Dr. Aynesworth's statement in an address, declaring that the science of medicine had often remedied physical ailments when nature had failed."

One need not be surprised to read shortly of a movement in Texas to bar from the state medical schools all text-books which teach that man possesses vestigial organs or embryological structures inherited from "any lower order of animals"!

While the educational institutions of Texas have had —and still have—in their service a number of highly competent men of science, the pathway of the non-

Fundamentalist professor is by no means an easy one to travel, especially in the denominational colleges, and particularly if the teacher is known to be an evolutionist. A case in point is that of Dr. Harold I. Gosline, of Dallas, who was kind enough to explain his story in some detail, at my request for authoritative information as to his experiences as a professor in Texas:

"I taught in Southern Methodist University the summer session of 1924, the winter session of 1925 and the summer session of 1925. I definitely stated that I would teach sociology from the biological standpoint and that other views might be presented by the theological department of the university. I was accused by the professor of sociology, H. L. Pritchett, of emphasizing sex too much, but the Dean, E. J. Jennings, stated that such a matter had not come to his attention. . . . It was mentioned only in connection with discussion of illegitimacy, which is one of the subjects that has to be considered in every course in sociology which touches upon the family. The real crux of the matter was evidently that the biological standpoint is modernistic, and, therefore, taboo. You know and I know that fanaticism is rarely open and above-board, working to accomplish its objects by the method of indirection.

"I taught at Baylor Medical School as professor of mental hygiene during the terms from 1923 to 1926 inclusive, except the last four lectures of 1926, when I was relieved by the professor of neurology and psychiatry, Dr. James J. Terrill, who is an ardent Sunday-School teacher in the church of Dr. Truett, whose power and influence here is that of a Baptist 'Pope.' In that course each year I had something to say, perhaps uncalled for, about persons with no training in biology giving opinions on biological matters. My remarks were called out by the teacher of medical jurisprudence, a lawyer who frequently 'ran down' evolution in his lectures on medical jurisprudence. The immediate occasion of my being relieved was an emphasis which I placed on the necessity of doing the required work of the course I was teaching, if the students

hoped to pass the course. The subject of mental hygiene was new and did not have the support of certain members of the faculty and of the Dean, Dr. Walter H. Moursund, and the students knew this."

What the science teacher has to face in the way of humiliation in Texas is graphically illustrated by a series of letters, published in *Science*, between an applicant for the chair of biology and the president of a Fundamentalist "college," both unnamed.

The first letter of the president:

"I wish information from you on the following: (1) What do you believe and teach in regard to the origin of man? (2) Do you sincerely believe the Old and New Testaments to be the word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice? (3) Would you obligate yourself while a member of this faculty not to teach anything that is opposed to any doctrine of the standards of the Presbyterian Church?

"The Board of Directors will require definite answers on these questions before electing any man to the chair of biology; therefore it is necessary for us to get very definite information along this line before we can proceed at all."

The candidate replied:

"My answers to your questions are as follows: No. 1. Being a Christian, I cannot be true to my belief and not teach the truth as I see it. Being a scientist, with all the evidence at hand, I cannot but believe in evolution. Man, being an animal, is governed by the same physiological laws and environmental stimuli as the lower animals. I cannot see how any student of the biological sciences, after making a study of life as exemplified in man and the lower animals with their perfect, delicate structures and wonderful adaptations to their environment, can do otherwise than see in and through it all the directing hand of God.

"No. 2. I sincerely believe the Old and New Testaments to be the word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

"No. 3. I would obligate myself while a member of your faculty not to teach anything that is opposed to any doctrine of the standards of the Presbyterian Church."

The president then answered:

"I am not sure as to what you really mean in your answer concerning the origin of man; neither do I understand fully and clearly your position on the subject of evolution. I do not know whether you really believe in evolution in the most thorough meaning of the word, or whether you believe more in development [!].

"I do not care to do more than simply get correctly your view of the origin of man and your position on evolution as a theory. If you do not object, I should be glad to have an additional statement from you in regard to this matter. I am willing to say that I have been considering most favorably your application, and want to deal with it with everything clearly before me."

The applicant then went more into detail, in the desire to show that no harm to the orthodoxy of his prospective pupils would follow his appointment:

"In answer to your last letter, I wish first to say that I am a *theistic evolutionist.* I believe in evolution as a development, but not as a development produced by chance but by the directing hand of God. I believe that the animals of to-day have been developed by evolution from pre-existing, but now extinct, animals, and that man is no exception. Therefore I do not believe that man has evolved from any of the anthropoid apes one sees in our zoological gardens. He has evolved along a line of ancestors predestined to culminate in man as we see him to-day. I do not believe in the theory of 'special creation.'"

But this was not enough. The president abruptly closed the correspondence by writing:

"I am very sorry that your position on the question of evolution is such as to make it impossible for me to recommend you for election to the chair of biology. Personally, I hold you in high regard."

In an article on "Texas Fundamentalism" (*The Haldeman-Julius Monthly*, November, 1926), R. L. Erwin, Jr., associate editor of *The Texas Utility News* (Dallas), writes of a Fundamentalist friend of his as follows:

"His idea of the theory of evolution tallied with that of several other average men questioned, all of whom obtained their information on the subject from preachers. Some smart guy named Darwin, or Darrow, he wasn't quite sure which, was trying to make people believe that men started by being born from monkeys about three thousand years ago, much to the detriment of their faith in The Book if they believed him! 'Maybe his [Darwin's] great-great-grandfather was a monkey, but mine sure wasn't.' And that's that. The mind of the yokel then turns to more important subjects, such as which team will win the afternoon ball game.

"The average man in Texas is not greatly interested in questions of religion, philosophy or science, except as they directly bear on his business. He considers his pastor an absolute authority on all things religious, historical or ethical, and lets it go at that. . . . In short, the Texan is still something of a pioneer, with the pioneer's customary lack of sophistication and culture.

"As elsewhere, the same old reason is back of Fundamentalism in Texas in the final analysis—ignorance of the most obvious and universal type. However, it may be said in our defense that here it is caused by a great indifference, rather than by a determined attack on progress in learning, despite the yowling of the Norrises."

Obviously, if this indifference is continued, Texas will be not only the first state of the Union in size, but also first to suffer the demoralizing effects of a fully developed Fundamentalist State Theocracy.

CHAPTER VI

THE SHAME OF TENNESSEE

HE war on evolution in Tennessee began many years ago, when the trustees of Vanderbilt University unceremoniously dismissed Prof. Alexander Winchell from the faculty. They had been thoroughly alarmed upon discovering that an evolutionary wolf had been let loose among the Fundamentalist lambs. Dr. Winchell smiled, returned north to continue his work as professor of geology at Syracuse University (with which he had alternated his teaching at Vanderbilt), and soon after was called to the University of Michigan, where he had previously taught.

Winchell was indeed an evolutionist—one of the first professors in our American colleges to espouse the theory so ably set forth in "The Origin of Species" and "The Descent of Man." But this gifted scientist and teacher was not an "atheistic evolutionist," one of his most popular works being his "Reconciliation of Science and Religion." Nevertheless, the good churchmen of Vanderbilt University did not wish to see evolution and the Book of Genesis "reconciled" even if Winchell thought it could be done. It is only fair to say that Vanderbilt is much broader nowadays, and that almost alone among Tennessee colleges it helped to denounce the present anti-evolution law. A full account of the

Winchell case is given in Andrew D. White's famous "History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom." Professor Winchell lived to see the theory of evolution generally adopted by virtually all men of science, and the doctrine taught in college class-rooms and laboratories as a matter of course, finally penetrating the high schools of the nation. He died in 1891, in his sixty-eighth year, venerated by his pupils and highly esteemed by men of science throughout the world.

In that same year, the liberalism of Vanderbilt by that time is evidenced by the following quotation from "The Mauve Decade," by Thomas Beer. It relates to Lindon Cabell Garland, then Chancellor of the university, mathematician, chemist and astronomer:

> "There was a little revolt of one against the process of Vanderbilt University in the spring of 1891. The rebel was the son of a clergyman in Georgia, densely shocked when a professor gave him translations from Haeckel and a classmate advised him to read the perfumed insufficiency of Ernest Renan's 'Life of Jesus.' Rebellion carried him through a quarrel with a young instructor and into the office of the chancellor, a Virginia gentleman named Lindon Cabell Garland. The boy stammered out expostulations; biology, agnosticism and the sinfulness of the French language bubbled together in his head, and, being a Georgian, he had committed an oration before the old mathematician said in his thin, aged drawl: 'Men never amount to much until they outgrow their fathers' notions, sir.' The rebellion of 1891 ended with the injection of that thought among boiling prejudices."

We hear no more of academic persecution of teachers in Tennessee until the spring of 1923, when college and university circles were shocked by the dismissal of Dr. Jesse W. Sprowls, the able professor of genetic psy-

chology at the state university. In ordering some text-books for his classes, Professor Sprowls included in the list Dr. James Harvey Robinson's excellent work, "Mind in the Making," in which the mind of man is, of course, discussed from the standpoint of evolution. Incidentally, this brilliant book also undermines certain other traditional preconceptions dear to the conservative mind.

The university authorities strongly objected to Professor Sprowls' choice of text-books, and soon thereafter he was notified that he would not be recommended for re-election to the faculty. This action attracted considerable attention outside of Tennessee, since it constituted a flagrant violation of the principle of academic freedom, defined by the American Association of University Professors as the right of teachers to present their personal beliefs and opinions on scientific questions in class-rooms. This does not mean, however, that professors have the right to insist that their opinions be accepted by the pupils. The teacher merely gives his opinion and presents the grounds on which it is based, and it is the privilege of the pupils to accept or reject the conclusions presented for their consideration.

Another principle involved in the Sprowls case is that known in academic circles as tenure of office. The Association holds that when a professor is elected to a faculty he cannot be removed for the time for which he is elected unless he violates the rules of "good conduct" in such a way as "to make the need of his removal obvious." In the case of Professor Sprowls himself, this principle was not involved. But other members of the faculty now became interested in the case; certain of his colleagues felt that he should not have been dis-

missed until an impartial hearing had been given him; and a petition was sent to the American Association of University Professors asking for an official investigation of affairs at the university.

Dean J. D. Hoskins was vexed by the publicity given the dismissal of Dr. Sprowls, and he especially resented the demand for an investigation of the status of the university on the question of academic freedom. He therefore called upon certain members of the faculty for a statement of what action, if any, had been taken in the matter. The questions included such as the following:

> "What do you know about or what have you had to do with the proposed constitution for the government of the University of Tennessee? Are you in sympathy with the present administration of the University of Tennessee and the present way of doing things? Have you attended any meetings dealing with the case of Prof. Jesse William Sprowls or any other meetings in which the administrative questions of the university were discussed? Are you a member of the American Association of University Professors? Did you sign the petition asking for an investigation of the university by this association? What do you know about the criticism and dissatisfaction expressed by other members of the faculty?"

At the end of the college year five other professors were dismissed, including Judge John Randolph Neal of the law department (afterwards defense counsel for Scopes), Dr. A. A. Schaeffer, professor of zoology (at the time away doing research work at a national foundation), Dr. Maurice Mulvania, dean of the pre-medical school, Dr. Robert A. Ellis of the department of pedagogy, and Dr. Robert S. Radford, professor of Latin. All had been with the university for a long time,

Dean Mulvania for seventeen years, and Judge Neal and Dr. Radford for fourteen.

While the educated element in Tennessee gave their unqualified moral support to the upholders of academic freedom, the uneducated and the Fundamentalists warmly applauded the university authorities. The merchants of Knoxville passed resolutions approving Pres. Harcourt A. Morgan's action, and the Methodists, Baptists, Associated Reform Presbyterians, and the Federated Presbyterian Churches of Fayetteville, in joint meeting, resolved:

> "That we consider the great State of Tennessee fortunate in having, at the head of our great university, a man who has the courage to combat evil in high places; that the pupils of Tennessee are to be congratulated that this State institution does not follow in the footsteps of the German [!] infidels in teaching that man sprang from a lower order of beings, but that man was created in the image of God, that the Bible is the true word of God, that man was destined for a future existence."

The anti-evolutionists had well served the cause of Fundamentalism at the price of academic freedom, and the stage was set for the great battle of 1925. Dr. Morgan is himself said to be an evolutionist, but the appropriations for the upkeep of the university were in the hands of Fundamentalist legislators, and, with the recent example of Kentucky fresh in his mind, he anticipated what might happen when the next legislature convened. As president of the university, Dr. Morgan deemed it necessary to "put the soft pedal on evolution."

The "Tennessee law" and the Scopes case show

plainly that his precautions were justified—at least from an administrator's point of view. Almost ludicrous is the fact that in April, 1925, Dr. Morgan also considered it necessary to cancel a lecture by Dr. Wolfgang Koehler, the celebrated German authority on the mentality of the higher apes; a measure taken also by the president of the University of North Carolina.

Owing largely to the vociferous activities of the late W. J. Bryan, the question of evolution became ever more prominent in Tennessee politics and religion. Mr. Bryan, now become chief lay spokesman for "the old-time religion," was called upon to help demolish the "pernicious, atheistic doctrine of evolution."

Defeated in his political aspirations time after time by "the intellectual crowd," Mr. Bryan gladly turned his attention to "the word of God" and its "protection." The Great Commoner now began to ask:

> "What right has a little irresponsible oligarchy of self-styled intellectuals to demand control of the schools of the United States, in which twenty-five millions of children are being educated at an annual expense of nearly ten billions of dollars?"

This, briefly, was the effective beginning of a nation-wide war upon science and modern enlightenment, some of the consequences of which have already been set forth in preceding pages. Since the first successful legal attack (barring the early Oklahoma case, described in Chapter VIII) occurred in Tennessee, a somewhat full discussion of this startling development in the history of science and education in the United States may prove of value here.

John Washington Butler, father of the anti-evolution bill in Tennessee, in 1920 ran for the legislature against E. L. White, a graduate of Vanderbilt University, and beat the "educated candidate" ten to one. Asked to explain the issue of this campaign, Butler told Doris Stevens:

"It was like this. I put in my circ'lars that I believed in the literal Bible, and that I was opposed to the teaching of evolution in the schools. I didn't say I would pass a law, but I said I was opposed to teachin' it."

In due time Butler introduced his bill, which went to the House Committee on Education; but the Macon county solon did not appear to speak in its behalf. With little opposition, it was passed in the House by a vote of 71 to 5. It appears that Bryan's pamphlet, "Is the Bible True?", and a weather-eye on the folk back home, made speech-making unnecessary.

In the Senate only two Senators spoke against its passage.

"On the first try-out," said Miss Stevens (in *The New York World*), "it failed of the necessary majority. Then the Speaker of the House, Lew Hill, a Democrat and a passionate Campbellite, left the chair and spoke for it. They say he made what is known as a typical Bryan appeal, 'Save our children for God!' 'Fight the infidels!' Immediately the Senate passed the bill, 24 to 6."

Encouraged by the success of the Butler Bill, Judd Acuff, of Knoxville, "whose membership in the Ku Klux Klan is stated as a positive fact," introduced what is called in the South "a straight Ku Klux Klan bill," which provided that no teacher be allowed to teach in

any school supported by public funds who did not swear allegiance to the Divinity of Christ. After a full day's discussion, only thirty votes could be mustered for this sectarian measure, and these were said to be Klan votes only.

The text of the anti-evolution bill, passed March 13, 1925, is as follows:

"An act prohibiting the teaching of the Evolution Theory in all the universities, normals and all other public schools of Tennessee, which are supported in whole or in part by the public school funds of the state, and to provide penalties for the violations thereof.

"Section 1. Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, That it shall be unlawful for any teacher in any of the universities, normals, and all other public schools of the state, to teach any theory that denies the story of the divine creation of man as taught in the Bible, and to teach instead that man has descended from a lower order of animals.

"Section 2. Be it further enacted, That any teacher found guilty of the violation of this act, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction, shall be fined not less than one hundred dollars ($100.00) nor more than five hundred dollars ($500.00) for each offense.

"Section 3. Be it further enacted, That this Act take effect from and after its passage, the public welfare requiring it."

Several differences will be noted between the wording of this anti-evolution law and others previously quoted, which became the basis of the legal defense of Scopes.

For some time preceding the enactment of the law, "gadfly evangelists," taking their cue from "the peerless orator," swarmed through the state, and "revivals were as thick as crows in a Middle Tennessee cornfield"—according to a writer who was on the ground

This statement was strongly resented by Fundamentalist ministers, who took occasion to denounce the writer from their pulpits.

The Unitarian minister at Knoxville, the Rev. D. M. Welch, who had been a teacher of history in the Knoxville High School for three years—and still was,—publicly denounced "itinerant evangelists of the jazz type." The school board met the next day, and charged Mr. Welch with "teaching Unitarianism in the classroom." The charge was found to be groundless. A wave of protest arose from the students, and he was finally reinstated on condition that he would drop his preaching. Mr. Welch finished his term in the school and then resigned, and has since been giving his whole time to the church, where he is free to express his honest convictions.

In his remarkable novel, "Teeftallow" (1925), depicting the rural life of Tennessee, T. S. Stribling gives us a "close-up" of the methods employed and the kind of persons concerned in the work of preparation for passage of the Tennessee anti-evolution law:

" 'Brother Blackman ast me as a man of science an' as a representative of the edjercational intrusts of this county to git up an' tell you-all what I thought of his plan. I want ter say I'm with him heart and soul. I want you justices to hear what he is goin' to ast you to do an' you do it. It'll be a blessin' to you an' yore childern the longest day you'll live. Honourable Judge an' justices of the court, lemme interduce Brother Blackman.'

"The evangelist stepped forward as the pedagogue retired.

" 'Gentlemen of the court,' began the minister in his profound voice, 'Brother Overall says it will be a blessin' to you

as long as you live. I say it will be a blessin' to you through etarnity. I tell you the angels are leanin' this minute over the battlements of Heaven, waitin' with hushed breaths an' beatin' hearts to see what the justices of Lane County air goin' to do here at this hour an' this minute!'

"The minister paused with a certain effect of embodying the supernatural world, of solidifying it in the air somewhere above their heads. He proceeded in his ponderous voice, and inquired slowly and solemnly, 'My frien's, do you b'lieve yore great gran'daddy was a monkey?'

"He paused, then with the revivalist's trick, shouted the same question with a different stress at the top of his lungs, 'Do you *b'lieve* yore great gran'daddy was a monkey?

" 'Oh, brethren, don't you *know* the Bible says man was made in the image of *God!* Then how *can* he be made in the image of a monkey?

" 'Brothers, judges,' gasped the divine, pausing to mop his dripping face, 'you know that our school books air full of this damnable doctrine. What air you goin' to *do* about it? Air ye goin' to let the deceivin' agnostic, hell-bound college perfessers send our childern to *hell?* Air they goin' to cry fer bread an' you give 'em a *stone!* It's a sin unto God an' a cryin' out of unrighteousness from the earth! What air ye goin' to do —what you goin' to *do?* I'm talkin' to you justices now; what *you* goin' to do?'

"Reverend Blackman shook a long forefinger at the justices.

" 'You know what you can do,' he replied to his own question, 'tear this infidel doctrine *out* of the school books! Tear it *out!* Give the old devil a thrust in the heart with the sword of truth! Strike a match to his sulfurious fires an' roast him out of the school books our blessed little childern's got to read. *Roast him out!* Ain't I right, Brother Overall?' he bellowed, beet-colored.

" 'You're right, Brother Blackman!'

" 'Then let's *all* be right!' chanted the preacher. 'Now, brothers an' justices of Lane County, when the clerk passes aroun' the petition I have drew up, I want ever' man who believes in God and wants to meet his childern in Heaven—I want him to

sign it. I want you to tell our legislatur' that we don't want no more infidel doctrines of the Godless Yankees sent down here in our school books, an' we won't *have* it! Let 'em know ol' Lane stan's fer God, an' God stan's fer ol' Lane! An' we do this hopin' our county escapes the destruction that God is shore to send on our Sodom and Gomorrah nation! Brethren, let us pray!'

"The parson lifted his hands and the whole courtroom bowed its head. His prayer was as vehement as his address and covered the same points. When he made an end, he retired, dripping with perspiration, while the blond clerk, rather hastily, passed around a petition which the minister had drawn up asking the Tennessee state legislature to remove all traces of the science of evolution from the school books of the state.

"The justices looked at it rather blankly and signed one after another. One of the court hesitated a moment. 'Professor Overall,' he asked, 'does our present school books teach there ain't no God an' our gran'fathers was monkeys?'

"Professor Overall rolled his prominent eyes on the questioner reprovingly. 'They certainly do, Brother Boggus. You can take my word as a teacher and a scholar.'

" 'I jest wanted to know,' said the justice in a chastened tone, and signed his name hurriedly."

After reading "Teeftallow," we are not surprised to learn that the same legislature which enacted the anti-evolution law "gave a close shave to a bill to bar Jews from teaching in the public schools."

During the debate in the state legislature on the Butler Bill, not one word of protest was heard from the State Department of Education, the University of Tennessee, or any other state educational institution (so far as I can learn) except the Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville.

As already indicated, the state university of Tennessee, like so many others, is dependent upon the votes of

the yokelry for operating funds. And it was necessary to call upon the 1925 Legislature for a greatly increased appropriation. Meanwhile, the university was being visited and inspected by committees of pious legislators. Silence on President Morgan's part was indeed golden. For a large majority of the Tennessee Legislature consists of Fundamentalists from the backward rural communities, infused with a holy zeal.

In a most informing article, written for *The New York Times* (July 19, 1925), Russell Owen gave a description of the rural population of the state which reinforces Mr. Stribling's account,—and accurately pictures the condition in many other states of the Union, all threatened with similar anti-evolution laws. To quote a few paragraphs:

"Science does not mean to them something which may be acquired without the loss of religious belief. It is a destructive force of darkness which they think will ruin their children. . . . When the defense proposed to bring in a number of eminent scientific and religious gentlemen to show that evolution is not necessarily an heretical doctrine, this countryside rose in its might to demand that it be not permitted. . . . So earnest and widespread became this protest that letters have been written by the score to Judge Raulston pleading with him to save Tennessee from the expression of these insidious ideas. . . .

"There are more relics of mediaeval belief in Tennessee than it would be imagined could exist in this part of the world. There is a little sect in the state which is doing its best to have adopted a bill prohibiting the teaching that the earth is round. They contend that to do so is to undermine their faith in the Bible. . . .

"This narrow outlook on life has bred an intolerance which finds its justification also in the Bible. As Darrow remarked in

court during his speech, there is no venom comparable to that of a person actuated by religious motives. When others attempt to expound their views they are met not only by unbelief, but by bitter retort. One who does not agree with them entirely is an 'infidel.' A person from outside their vicinity, particularly if he is of different faith, is a foreigner. That word is heard here frequently. They have no sympathy with others and only hatred for those who contradict them and attempt to force an argument under their armor. Hatred has flared up repeatedly in the few days of the Scopes trial, and when it has come it has generally been from the prosecution, with an unrestraint which it is not pleasant to watch."

There was for a time some reason to doubt whether Gov. Austin Peay would sign "House Bill No. 185." But he did. Doris Stevens throws some additional light on the question of why he did:

"On to Governor Peay went the bill. Peay is a Baptist. Dr. W. F. Powell of Nashville, one of the most influential Baptist ministers in the South, strongly urged approval. Several liberal ministers protested. Governor Peay admitted he was harassed. Apparently he hesitated. To one of the two Senators who opposed the bill he said that it was an absurd bill and that he ought to have been spared signing such a bill by having it fail to pass. As the protesting Senator left the Governor's chambers, a large deputation of Powell's Baptists entered."

After signing the law, Governor Peay sent a message to the Senate and the House of Representatives in which he attempted to vindicate his action. Some of his reasons for signing were a bit surprising:

"The constitution of Tennessee records the belief of our people in God and a future life. . . . By what laws shall the rewards and punishments be meted to us in the future state? Obviously, the answer must be by those laws which God has

revealed to us. And the further answer must be that His laws have been revealed to us in the Holy Bible, if at all. . . . Nobody will deny that the Holy Bible teaches that man was created by God in His own image. This bill is founded in the idea and belief that the very integrity of the Bible in its statement of man's divine origin is denied by any theory that man descended or has ascended from any lower order of animals. . . . It will be seen that this bill does not require any particular theory or interpretation of the Bible regarding man's creation to be taught in the public schools. . . .

"Obviously, there can be no infringement of this provision [freedom of conscience] unless the teacher in our public schools by this bill is controlled or interfered with in his right of conscience in teaching the subject of man's creation. This bill does not do that in the sense and meaning of the constitution. He has the undoubted right to believe and think on the subject without restraint from any human authority, but the constitution does not accord to the teacher the right to teach in our schools in any manner whatever he may choose. . . .

"After a careful examination I can find nothing of consequence in the books now being taught in our schools with which this bill will interfere in the slightest manner. Therefore, it will not put our teachers in any jeopardy. *Probably the law will never be applied.* It may not be sufficiently definite to permit of any specific application or enforcement. *Nobody believes that it is going to be an active statute.*

"But this bill is *a distinct protest against an irreligious tendence to exalt so-called science,* and deny the Bible in some schools and quarters—a tendency fundamentally wrong and fatally mischievous in its effects on our children, our institutions and our country." [Italics mine.]

Mr. Bryan, as is well known, agreed with Governor Peay that "the hand which writes the pay check should rule the schools."

Dr. George Norlin, president of the University of Colorado, gave it as his opinion (in an address at

Boulder, Colorado, June 24, 1925) that the public education of North America is seriously menaced if the Tennessee doctrine gains ground that truth may be fixed by a counting of noses.

"I dare say that the state of Tennessee," he remarked, "has the power to teach through its public schools that the earth is flat, that the sun rises and sets, that the moon produces its own light, . . . and that any Tennessee cracker may . . . ride to the most distant star, if these things seem true to the voting majority of the state."

The passage of the anti-evolution law led to an anomalous situation among teachers of science in Tennessee, for the accredited text-books, still in use, were all based upon the assumption that, broadly speaking, evolution is a recognized process of nature.

The story has often been told of how four young men, gathered around a table in a drug-store in the main street of Dayton, Tennessee—two young lawyers just fresh from law school; a chemical engineer; and John Thomas Scopes, instructor of biology in the county high school—were casually discussing the anti-evolution law. The engineer, George W. Rappleyea, manager of the Cumberland Coal and Iron Co., suggested that "the best way to find God was in the laboratory of the biologist, and the open book of the geologist." Scopes remarked that he "could not see how a man could teach the theories of biology from the state text-books and escape bringing in a general discussion of the theory of evolution." Mr. Rappleyea took down from a shelf (the country drug-store being also the book-store) a copy of "A Civic Biology," by Prof. George W. Hunter. A glance

through its pages revealed at once that the doctrine of evolution permeated the text. "Do you follow this text closely in your teaching?" asked the engineer. Scopes answered that he did. "Well, then, you are guilty of violating the anti-evolution law and you ought to be arrested and tried."

Mr. Rappleyea suggested that a test case should be made, and urged Scopes to "be the goat." Scopes, somewhat reluctantly, consented. It was then agreed that on the following day a warrant should be sworn out by Rappleyea for the arrest of Scopes. The friendly complainant then appealed by wire to the American Civil Liberties Union in New York for moral and financial support, which was immediately promised.

One may readily account for Mr. Rappleyea's great interest in the Fundamentalist-Evolutionist controversy, so far as his concern with the subject as a scientist is considered. But we are indebted to Dr. Charles Francis Potter (now of Antioch College), who attended the trial as unofficial aid to the defense, for the following further light on Rappleyea's stand:

Some time prior to the arrest of Scopes, Rappleyea attended a funeral service held for a boy killed in a mill. He heard a Fundamentalist minister tell the boy's mother that it was his duty to inform her that her child was at that minute burning in eternal torment because he had not been baptized. "I got to be true to my God," said the preacher when Mr. Rappleyea begged him to say some word of comfort to the stricken woman. From that moment the engineer was intensely interested in the manifestations of Fundamentalism, and worked toward the climax of the Dayton trial.

On May 9, 1925, Scopes was arrested and charged with violating the statute prohibiting, in effect, the teaching of evolutionary theories in the public schools. The twenty-four-year-old science teacher was given a preliminary hearing by three justices of the peace, and held for action by the Rhea county grand jury. Bond was fixed at $1,000, but the state expressed a willingness to accept the recognizance of the defendant and the court acquiesced. "Thus for the first time since the promulgation of the theory by Charles Darwin sixty-six years earlier, the dispute over evolution was brought into the courts."

In an interview with W. K. Hutchinson, of the International News Service, Scopes said:

> "My purpose in voluntarily becoming the center of a test case was to safeguard our public schools from encroachments by any religious group. Education means a broadening of the mind. To limit our curriculum in the public schools of Tennessee, as this law provides, is to narrow the field of education, to foster bigotry, and to force the religious sentiments of one group upon all the people, in defiance of their constitutional guarantees."

The defense before the justice court was based on the contention that the law was unconstitutional. To this, however, the three justices, Benson, Green, and Wilbur, dissented, stating that they did not consider the decision within their province. "The defendant," said Benson, the spokesman, "is at least technically if not intentionally guilty, hence our decision to hold him for action by the grand jury."

The prosecution attorneys, Wallace S. Haggard and Sue K. Hicks, quoted from "A Civic Biology," by Pro-

fessor Hunter (then of Knox College, but now of Pomona College, California) to show that the theory of evolution was advocated in this book from which the defendant had taught. The defense attorneys, Judge Neal and John L. Godsey, did not deny this, but said that the book was given the defendant by the state from which to teach his course. They also claimed that the act was improperly drawn in that evolution was mentioned in the preamble but not in the body.

On May 25th the grand jury, sitting in special session, returned a true bill against Scopes, charging him with the teaching of evolution in violation of the state's anti-evolution law. Judge J. T. Raulston—a Fundamentalist evangelist—called a special term of the Rhea County Circuit Court for July 10th to hear the case. It is worthy of note, parenthetically, that up to three weeks before presiding at the trial, Judge Raulston conducted revival meetings at different points near Dayton.

In charging the grand jury, he declared that he considered a violation of the anti-evolution statute a high misdemeanor, regardless of the question of constitutionality or policy. The judge then spoke of the "evil example of the teacher disregarding constituted authority in the presence of those whose thought and morals he is to direct and guide."

On a superficial view, this last statement might be deemed incontrovertible. However, a different opinion was expressed by *The New York Sun*, which is worthy of record, since the same principles will be involved in many other states in which an attempt to outlaw the teaching of the theory of evolution will soon be made:

"The judge explained an undeniably sound legal principle when he told the jurymen it was not within their province to inquire into the policy or the wisdom of the legislation, matters which rightly belong elsewhere. His reasoning was surely open to challenge, however, when he argued that absolute submission to every new legislative enactment is the duty of a citizen. . . . There is one thing that is conceivably worse [than such disobedience] and that is the refusal of an honest teacher to make an honest protest against legislation he believes to be wrong and immoral. . . . Indeed, such obedience has been refused in principle and in action down through the ages. . . . Almost every great victory that has been won for popular liberties has come through somebody's refusal to submit to some kind of legal usurpation. . . . Surely the cause of intellectual liberty is as worthy of risking personal pain for as the cause of political liberty ever was."

At about this time, the Board of Education of Carroll county announced that it would henceforth employ no teacher who *believed* in evolution. The board also condemned Hendrik Willem Van Loon's "Story of Mankind," which had been sent to the schools by the circulating department of the state library. It therefore burned the book, "and demanded, with stentorian emphasis, that like justice should be executed upon it wherever it introduced its offensive presence into the school libraries of the 'Hog-and-Hominy' Commonwealth."

The Board of Education of De Kalb county next announced that thereafter it would sign no contract with any teacher until it had first obtained the applicant's views on evolution. In a resolution adopted in June, 1925, the board declared:

"We here and now refuse to spend money that belongs to the tax-payers of our county in the employment of teachers to

poison the minds of the children of De Kalb county with theories that finally run into infidelity."

The Truth Seeker (July 4, 1925) said in connection with this action:

"Instead of spending tax-payers' money for learning, the board will buy orthodoxy with it. The brains of the children will be sacrificed on the altar of Fundamentalism, and a continued low level of education will thereby be assured."

Supt. Walter White, of the schools of Dayton itself, expressed the real purpose behind the Fundamentalist attack upon science and civilization in his declaration that he would "recommend no one as a teacher in the Rhea county schools who is not a Fundamentalist." The same spirit of bigotry and determination to impede progress pervades the Fundamentalist drive from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Rio Grande to—and through —Canada.

The Scopes trial was opened on July 10, 1925. The jury of twelve men was chosen within a few hours thereafter. The question of admitting the testimony of scientists and scholars was at once brought—rather dramatically—to the front. "The defense contends that there are competent witnesses for both sides and the prosecution announces that he will fight the admission of such evidence to the utmost."

Before the selection of the trial jury, a grand jury was sworn in and Scopes was reindicted, the judge explaining that the indictment returned on May 25th was considered of doubtful legality because of an oversight in lapsed time between the summons to the grand jury and the meeting of the grand jury.

Clarence Darrow (July 11th) accused the state's representatives in the prosecution of making an effort to "run away from the facts" in their struggle to prevent the introduction of expert testimony on science and religion, and charged that this effort was "doubtless on account of their inability to get any scientific man in the world to deny the facts that prove the correctness of evolution."

Darrow's remarks were directed chiefly against Bryan, assisting the state in the prosecution; for Bryan had previously declared before the Progressive Club of Dayton that "the contest between evolution and Christianity is a duel to the death." When it came to the summoning of his own witnesses, however, no recognized scientist could be obtained to give testimony against evolution. Two prominent Roman Catholics (Patrick H. Callahan, director of the work of the Knights of Columbus during the war and now chairman of their committee on religious tolerance [whose official organ—and also that of the diocese—is *The Record*, of Louisville]; and Benedict Elder, secretary of the Catholic Press Association and editor of *The Record*) offered their "expert testimony"; and Bryan also mentioned "a Professor Price"—meaning George McCready Price, a Seventh Day Adventist "geologist" unknown to other geologists or to the world of science in general. This gentleman, formerly a teacher of English in a Seventh Day Adventist school, and all of whose few degrees come from the institutions maintained by this same unanimously Fundamentalist denomination, supports the literal Biblical account of creation and accepts the Noachic flood as an historical event! And even he, Bryan's sole

"scientist," was in England and not available for the Dayton trial.

A very clear idea of the state of mind of the average Tennesseean may be derived from an incident published in the press on May 20th. It may be recalled that certain enterprising citizens of Chattanooga had become somewhat jealous of Dayton's free advertising, and decided to rush through, in advance of the Scopes trial, a test case of their own (which project was later abandoned). A meeting was called in Dayton to protest against this contemplated action. At this meeting Mr. Rappleyea gave a short talk in explanation of the theory of evolution and in defense of Scopes. No sooner had Rappleyea stated his endorsement of the theory that man did evolve from a lower order of animals than a barber in the audience rushed to the rostrum and assaulted the engineer (who is physically a small man), on the ground that Rappleyea's remarks were a reflection on his (the barber's) family! A short time later one of the two policemen in the town asked Rappleyea to sit down in a store where they met and as soon as he was seated struck him to the ground. All of which goes to demonstrate that the nearer the opponent of evolution is, mentally, to the common simian stem, the greater his antagonism to the grand doctrine of man's development "from lower forms of life."

After Bryan's death, in a memorial speech in Chicago, Judge Raulston professed his belief in "the God of Bryan," and (says a United News Dispatch) "at times during his speech Judge Raulston wept, especially when moved by his own reference to the possibility of his

parents' having sprung from lower forms of animal life."

"If these people are ignorant in our eyes," remarks A. Washington Pezet in *The Forum*, "we should neither scorn nor pity them. They are ignorant not because they are unintelligent, but because the region in which they live is a cultural desert largely because the North trampled their native culture underfoot in its war to free the slaves. . . . Taking advantage of their natural preponderance they have established an ecclesiastical authority. Renegade to the most sacred principle of Protestantism,—the right of the Private Mind to interpret Holy Scripture for itself,—they have set up in our midst an Authority as real as that of Roman Catholicism. Renegade to the most sacred principle of Americanism,—that Church and State shall be separate,—they have in effect made the state a party to their beliefs and the instrument for their enforcement, thus recreating a situation which their ancestors came here to escape. . . . To-day religion no longer exerts the direct tangible authority it did three hundred years ago. But its authority is none the less real and apparent if only we look below the surface of events to their basic causes. Ecclesiastical authority can no longer appeal to the rack and the torture chamber; instead it employs the weapons of our age: propaganda, organized public opinion, legal action, and economic pressure. Through these means it may still entrench itself as it has done in Tennessee."

It seems appropriate to remark here, however, that this same ignorance and fanaticism exist in parts of the country never "trampled underfoot" or made "a cultural desert."

On July 15th, Scopes was brought to the bar, and pleaded not guilty.

To tell the whole story of the now world-famous trial

at Dayton would require a volume in itself—in fact, more than one has already been published. It is estimated that two million words were sent by the Western Union Telegraph Co. to the newspapers of the country. The average daily press file during the trial was 165,000 words.

To summarize from the point already reached: The state offered as witness Superintendent of Schools Walter White (who was also assisting in the prosecution); F. E. Robinson, chairman of the Rhea county school board; and two boys, pupils of Scopes, who testified that he had taught them biology from Hunter's textbook.

The state then rested and the defense brought forward the first of its scientific witnesses, Dr. Maynard M. Metcalf, of Johns Hopkins University. These witnesses had come from all over the country, and the list included such authorities as Prof. Kirtley Mather of Harvard, Prof. W. C. Curtis of the University of Missouri, Prof. Edwin Grant Conklin of Princeton, Prof. Arthur M. Miller of the University of Kentucky, Dr. Shailer Mathews of the University of Chicago, Prof. William M. Goldsmith of Southwestern College, and many others of equally high standing. The state objected to their testimony regarding evolution or religion as "incompetent"; and after four days of wrangling the judge ruled that they could not testify before the jury. They were allowed, however, to make depositions, which were read into the record, with the jury absent, and were later used in making the appeal.

After closing arguments by both sides, including the famous cross-examination of Bryan by Darrow, the trial

ended on July 21st with the expected conviction of Scopes. He was given the minimum fine, $100, to the great disappointment of John Washington Butler, author of the bill. A press story gives a picture of the defendant at this moment:

"Young Scopes . . . stood before the bar with a gold-epauletted policeman beside him, and Judge Raulston pronounced sentence before his counsel could suggest that Mr. Scopes might have something to say.

" 'Oh,' exclaimed Judge Ralston, 'Have you anything to say, Mr. Scopes, as to why the Court should not impose punishment upon you?'

"Mr. Scopes said: 'Your Honor, I feel that I have been convicted of violating an unjust statute. I will continue in the future, as I have in the past, to oppose the law in any way I can. Any other action would be in violation of my ideal of academic freedom, that is, to teach the truth as guaranteed in our Constitution, of personal and religious freedom. I think the fine is unjust."

After welcoming what he called a duel to the death between evolution and religion, Mr. Bryan, as has been stated, withdrew from that challenging attitude, and insisted that no testimony of a scientific nature be admitted from defense witnesses. Arthur Brisbane hit the nail squarely on the head in saying:

"The learned judge in the monkey trial says scientific experts must not be heard—a wise decision. If a great state has decided by law that twice two are five it would be foolish to allow mathematicians to testify."

The late Dr. W. E. Musgrave, editor of *Better Health* (San Francisco) had a most pertinent editorial in his number of August, 1925:

"Were you surprised when you read in the big metropolitan dailies the striking headlines, 'Scientists Barred'? Eminent volunteers, representing many branches of science, were ready to take the stand and furnish their opinions and their interpretations of scientific data on the earth's age, the antiquity of man, his resemblance to apes and other species of the animal kingdom, the prehistoric ancestor whose offspring evolved through millions of years into man, monkey, whale and reptile.

"Such scientists may know a great deal about the laws of nature, but it is apparent they know very little about political procedure and the laws of the land. We believe that it is significant that the scientists were barred. . . .

"One of the scientists who went to Tennessee and was barred from testifying for Scopes came from an eastern state that has no medical college. Why? Because there is a law in his state forbidding the dissection of any human body, and no student can be adequately trained in medicine without actually working on and studying the body. When this law was proposed the scientists were indifferent and said it had no significance. What would happen if all the other states passed the same law? The doctors of the future would be as untrained and incompetent as cultists. . . .

"Scientists from time to time decry and belittle politics as something beneath the notice of the erudite. Such men, by their indifference and inactivity, place the right of self-government out of their hands. . . . If in its operation the actual government runs counter to the theories of scientists, and they are occasionally barred, one of the reasons may be found in the failure of a large number of scientists and other intelligent citizens to inform themselves and vote intelligently and regularly. There are some who are always clamoring for government by some Solomon, but they forget to go to the polls to elect this superman.

"What has been done in Tennessee will probably be attempted in California [and elsewhere]. . . . When the battle reaches our Legislature it will be decided not by resolutions or

this summer's whirlwind, but by votes of members who will be elected next year."

Mr. Bryan and his cohorts did not by any means overlook "political procedure" and organization as factors in the anti-science struggle of Fundamentalism. See how Bryan led up to this phase of the problem in the following statement:

"At present, teachers are not examined as to their thought on religion [?]: if, however, a teacher when once employed is at liberty to rob Christian children of their religious beliefs, then Atheists, Agnostics, Infidels and all others who seek to undermine the Christian religion will find it difficult to secure employment as teachers in Christian communities, and the school boards will become much more important officials than they are now.

"If religion has to be protected in the election of school boards, then school board elections may become the most important elections held, for parents are much more interested in their children and in their children's religion than they are in any political policies or in the election of any particular candidates—even more interested in their children than in who shall be governor or president."

Toward the close of the Scopes trial, Supt. Walter White asked the Hon. J. Will Taylor, Representative in Congress from the Second Tennessee District and Republican National Committeeman from the state, to sponsor a federal anti-evolution bill in Congress. The proposed bill would provide that no educational institution in which the theory of evolution is taught may receive any funds from the Federal Government. This would affect most of the government scientific departments and many of the leading state universities, which are beneficiaries

under the Smith-Hughs Act. Mr. Taylor, though himself a Fundamentalist, believed that the bill would do harm, and refused to introduce it.

Again, on July 21st, Mr. White announced that Representative Upshaw, of Georgia, would soon introduce such a bill, to be prepared by White. Whether this particular bill ever appears in Congress or not, Upshaw will not be its sponsor, since, as previously noted, he was defeated for re-election in 1926.

Those who discount the actual Fundamentalist vote must recognize that besides the avowed Fundamentalists, there is to be considered a vast "unconvinced multitude hidden in the intellectual byways," long silent or indifferent, but now vocal and more or less militant. Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, remarked recently:

> "The condition in which we now find ourselves is due to what I once ventured to describe as the revolt of the unfit—if in these persecuting days one may venture to use even the language of the proscribed doctrine of evolution. In modern terms, it is due to the inferiority complex. . . . The inferiority complex leads its victims to strive by brute force to establish conformity to type and to establish some quite irrational doctrine of thought or of conduct."

In November, 1925, the Tennessee Academy of Sciences, in session at Nashville, passed a resolution deploring and urging repeal of the anti-evolution law. The resolution called the statute "in effect an unfortunate limitation of the intellectual freedom of teachers of science in our public schools." It continued:

> "The law marks a backward step in our education program and takes away important privileges heretofore available to

students, especially those in our higher institutions. The Academy regards as contrary to the basic principles of freedom and the best interests of citizenship any attempt to hamper by statute the pursuit of truth and the discovery and teaching of the facts of nature."

It was following this resolution that the Bible Crusaders donated $5,000 to help fight any attempt to repeal the Tennessee law.

"The affair at Dayton," remarked Joseph Wood Krutch, associate editor of *The Nation* (July 29, 1925), "has taught several valuable lessons. It has shown conclusively that the danger, often referred to by liberals, of laws that will reduce the United States to a bondage more complete than that of the darkest Puritan village of colonial New England, is no fantastic danger but one real and present; and it has shown also that the only possible way in which that danger can be fought is with a bitterness and vigor equal to that of those who provoke it. The mob is up; it has tasted blood and smelled smoke. Fair words are useless, for with every concession it grows in strength and determination; and it will not do to rest quietly behind the Constitution, for the Constitution is not an impregnable wall. It is subject to change, and, as Mr. Darrow said in a quotation from Bancroft which we may have occasion to find all too true, 'It is right to preserve freedom in constitutions, but when the spirit of freedom has fled from the hearts of the people, then its matter is easily sacrificed under the law.' "

The Rev. Dr. Albert O. Dieffenbach, editor of *The Christian Register* [Unitarian], has well said:

"A state religion is one which is recognized and preferred above all others. Such a religion has been established by law in Tennessee. The majority Fundamentalists in the various denominations have prevailed not only in their churches but

also in the Legislature. A dogma has become a statute. A virtual state church has thus arisen, composed of many sects, with like doctrines and political purposes, and the effect of their dominance and solidarity is the setting up of a monarchy in the heart of a democracy. The fundamental factor in a monarchic state is not the King or Emperor, but the spiritual dogma that divine right resides in a ruler. . . . With the rising tide of Fundamentalism, we have seen a Legislature [and now two of them] assume divine authority, become, in fact, exactly what the Emperor or King once was [head of the church]. The Legislature, that is to say, is both spiritual authority and political legislator. And thus democracy as we understand and cherish it has disappeared in the state of Tennessee [and also in Mississippi]. To-day we have, in consequence, one of the greatest religious issues in the history of Christendom."

None of the commentators on the Tennessee anti-evolution law raises any doubt as to the sincerity of the Fundamentalist legislators. But, as Dr. Dieffenbach has wisely observed:

"The Fundamentalist state-church believer, who is an enemy of the democratic principle, is a dangerous person in power, because what he believes is of necessity what he does. It is axiomatic that truth is always something to be done."

Chester Rowell, the well-known California publicist and writer, brings up an extremely interesting point in this connection. Commenting on how much has been made of the fact that the anti-evolutionists of Tennessee —and elsewhere—are "sincere," Mr. Rowell says:

"It is not the honesty of an opinion, but its intelligence, that makes it valuable. Certainly those who do not know what evolution is, nor how the conclusions regarding it were reached—who, like Mr. Bryan, do not even know what 'hypothesis'

means, and think it is the same thing as 'guess,' or who think that 'theory' is the opposite of 'fact' and 'truth'—are not equipped to have their 'opinions,' however 'honest,' weighed against the practically unanimous view of experienced observers."

On July 22, 1925, Rollin Lynde Hartt, in a thoughtful article entitled "What Lies Beyond Dayton," in *The Nation* for that date, aptly said that evolution was only superficially the issue in Tennessee:

"At bottom, the issue is a vastly older and more important question—the question as to whether the separation of church and state shall be maintained. The Fundamentalists are not saying, even among themselves [with the exception of the Ku Klux Klan]: 'There should be a Protestant state church in America,' nor are they saying, even among themselves: 'Theocracy is the ideal system of government.' No more are they saying, even among themselves: 'Fundamentalism attempts to establish a protectorate over the United States of America. Just as a Khedive is retained in Egypt, or a Sultan in Morocco, or a Maharajah in India, so the present rulers will be retained in America; only, the Fundamentalist Party will rule those rulers.' No such monstrous ambitions are consciously entertained by Fundamentalists, but the significance of Fundamentalism lies, not in what it is consciously but in what it is unconsciously. Unconsciously it puts the church above the state."

In an address before the national convention of the laymen of the Unitarian Church (Lenox, Massachusetts, September 19, 1925), which was virtually an answer to Mr. Bryan's posthumously published speech intended for the Scopes trial, Dudley Field Malone defined the real issue at Dayton as follows:

"Conceding readily that Bryan's motives were pure, nevertheless he was the able leader of the most sinister movement in

the United States. The congregation of literalists back of Bryan, whose activities have resulted in such measures as the Tennessee anti-evolution law, are trying their best to destroy those guarantees of religious liberty that Jefferson established, Madison fought for, and every liberal since then has considered as sacred.

"The issue at Dayton was not faith against agnosticism, it was not science against religion. The issue was and is this: Shall the constitutional guarantee of religious freedom and complete separation of church and state be violated or narrowed by any creed thinking to write its scheme of salvation into the law, or by any legislative majority seeking the votes of a literalist constituency?

"The psychology of fear, which crucified Jesus, banished Galileo, murdered Bruno and burned Jeanne d'Arc, is the animating force behind the Fundamentalist movement in the United States to-day."

Out of the mass of newspaper, magazine and personal statements made on the Tennessee law and the principles involved, I have selected a few quotations which will apply with equal force to all similar cases that may—and certainly will—arise from time to time in other states of the Union.

Clarence Darrow pointed out the greatest danger of all in an interview with Jack Lait in Chicago on July 8, 1925. He struck at the very heart of the current war on the scientific spirit and the method of science when he said:

"Those who are behind the prosecution are honest. They believe with the zeal of the crusader and have no doubt they are right. The less men know the fewer doubts they have. They are opening the doors for a reign of bigotry and persecution equal to anything in the middle ages. No man's belief will be safe if they win. They will not be satisfied with even

a belief in Christ and Christianity, but will enforce their own sort of belief in them. . . . If such a law can be put over and sustained in Tennessee, it can and probably will be in many other states."

An editorial in *The San Francisco Daily News* strikes this same note:

"Many thinking people see a serious menace to our liberty in the Tennessee law that forbids the teaching of anything except the Biblical story of creation in the public schools of that state. They see the beginning of a state religion and the end of freedom to worship God in one's own way. . . . That this Tennessee law marks a successful effort to establish Fundamentalism as the state religion of Tennessee there is no doubt. . . . If this is in accordance with the Constitution of Tennessee and the Constitution of the United States, then there is no reason why the same Fundamentalist majority should not decide next that no man may hold office in Tennessee who does not accept literally the account of the creation in Genesis, or that no man shall do business in Tennessee who does not accept it. Once the state has officially adopted an item in the creed of a religious sect and placed behind that doctrine the police power of the state, there is no reason to prevent its making a thorough job of it. There is no reason why it should not ordain that no marriage is legal unless consecrated by a minister who rejects the theory of evolution."

A letter written to *The Knoxville News* expresses the feeling of the average Fundamentalist:

"I notice you are trying to give our governor a black eye for signing the anti-evolution bill. Any thoughtful man should be against this awful theory of evolution. It should be legislated, routed, run and kicked out of existence back to its place of origin which is in hell, because its teachings are against the word of God.

"You do not have to read the Bible through to find out that such a thing is false. You will have only to read the first chapter of Genesis, and then you will have to say the teachings of the Bible are false in order to accept evolution. The anti-evolution law prohibits the teaching that the world was created in any way except as set forth in Genesis. That is as it should be. Our children can now go to school without having all their faith and hope destroyed by science."

In an editorial entitled "A Fight for Liberty" (May 27, 1925), *The New York Sun* made some comments on the Tennessee situation which should reach a wider public, since similar laws may be enacted in a number of states before the end of 1929:

"If the Legislature of a state has a right to distinguish among religious doctrines, and say that nothing shall be taught in the schools which conflicts with certain of them, the sooner the public knows it the better. For if that hypothesis is correct it will be only a step from the negative to the positive, since if the Legislature can forbid the teaching of one thing it certainly can enjoin the teaching of another.

"It is not the truth or falsity of the evolution theory that is on trial in Tennessee or the credence to be given to the Biblical account of man's creation. The issue is whether a mediaeval conception of law which asserts the state's right to regulate the moral, mental and spiritual development of its people can square with those constitutional provisions which are clearly intended to keep church and state forever separate.

"The Tennessee statute forbids the teaching in any school supported by state funds of any theory which 'disregards, denies or brings into disrepute' the Biblical narrative and teaches instead that 'man has descended from a lower order of animals.' If this means anything, it means that the first chapter of Genesis has been incorporated into the Revised Statutes of the state. It was, in fact, read to the Grand Jury from the

bench in the Scopes case, forming part of the formal charge of the judge, John T. Raulston."

This editorial was followed next day by another, from which I take the following suggestive paragraph:

"The general and somewhat loose assumption that Tennessee's anti-evolution case is headed direct for the Supreme Court of the United States is scarcely to be justified on any satisfactory legal grounds. Nothing has yet been shown to warrant a supposition that the Federal Government will be in any way involved in the matter. The weight of authority, on the contrary, appears to be that the controversy must end if the Supreme Court of Tennessee should decide that the statute involved is not in conflict with the Constitution of Tennessee. . . . The Supreme Court of the United States has already held in two important cases (Calder vs. Ball and Colorado Power Company vs. Halderman) that it has 'no jurisdiction to determine that any law of the State Legislature contrary to the Constitution of such state is void.' . . . There is a long line of decisions affecting such questions as are involved in the Scopes case, which hold in substance: 'The Constitution makes no provision for protecting the citizens of the prospective states in their religious liberties; that is left to the State Constitutions and laws. Nor is there any inhibition imposed by the United States Constitution in this respect on the states'—Note to The Constitution of the United States, Senate Document 154, Sixty-Eighth Congress, First Session. Tennessee's own Constitution, however, . . . has always insisted so sternly that religious issues be kept out of state affairs that, although it bars from public office any person who denies the existence of God or a state of future rewards, it also denies membership in the Legislature to clergymen and priests (Article IX, Sections 1 and 2)."

Judge Neal himself expressed the opinion that "the

general public has a wrong impression of the issues at stake in the Scopes case." He said:

"We will not attempt to prove evolution either right or wrong. We will wage our fight on four great principles of constitutional law. The evolution and anti-evolution controversy just happens to be involved incidentally. . . .

"The state has virtually said that no science at all shall be taught in the public schools or the state university. We have examined and found that twenty text-books used at the University of Tennessee contain the theories of evolution prohibited by this statute. It is impossible for any instructor to teach biology, zoology, botany, geology, psychology, sociology, philosophy or history, according to the text-books now used in the high schools of the state, and not violate this law."

Compare with this Governor Peay's boast that "there is nothing of consequence in the books now being taught in our schools with which this bill will interfere in the slightest manner!"

Judge Neal's opinion summarizes the views expressed by the press of the entire country in commenting on the enactment of this reactionary law. "No matter what justification exists in the minds of the southern legislators for bills of this type," said *The Denver Clarion*, "their enactment symbolizes a return to the dark ages in both educational and religious thought." "The question," commented *The Nation*, "is not merely one of whether such laws accord with American institutions. The question is whether among civilized people ignorance and intolerance, even when indulged in by the majority and made into law, should be permitted to stifle education." And *The New York World* very pertinently remarked:

"The issue in the Tennessee case is not merely the issue of academic freedom. It is the much greater issue of whether, after a century and a quarter under the American principle that there shall be no state religion, we shall take the first decisive step which leads to an established church. In this Tennessee case there is revealed at last the full significance of the movement which in these last years has as its spear-point the Ku Klux Klan."

Scopes himself, in a letter to *The Forum* (July, 1925), stated that:

"Religious intolerance is to-day one of the controlling factors in our daily life. Not so long ago one of my friends told me that he had been offered a position as instructor in a state institution, but only provided that he join a certain church. Religious intolerance is with us, as is shown by the various laws that have been passed by our various State Legislatures, and by the attempts to pass others."

One aspect of constitutional law not specifically discussed in any of the citations so far made in this book relates to the contention of the attorney general that the Tennessee law was not an abridgment of religious or civil liberty because it was not of "general application" —which, of course, would apply to all anti-evolution measures relating to teaching in state-supported schools or colleges. Scopes, it was said, could stand on the street corners and expound the theory of evolution "till he was hoarse, and we could not interfere with him." But, added the attorney general, Mr. Scopes "cannot go into the public schools . . . and teach his theory. . . . The legislature has a right to control that. They do it in the exercise of their police power."

Now, it was conceded that the object of the anti-

evolution statute was and is purely religious: namely, to conserve in the public educational establishments of the state the belief in "the story of the divine creation of man as taught in the Bible."

"The religious character of this belief is denoted by the fact that such creation is called 'divine,' and that the story, belief in which is to be conserved, is 'taught in the Bible'—a book held to body forth the religion established by God Himself."

"The law," said Mr. Bryan, "represents the determination of the parents to guard the *religious* welfare of their children." But the late Delphin M. Delmas, the celebrated trial lawyer, pointed out, in a speech made to the Los Angeles Bar Association shortly before his death, that:

"If a law can find its justification in the fact that it guards the religious welfare of children, then all children—those who attend private schools or no school as well as those who attend public schools—stand in the same relation to the object of the law. No difference exists between the two upon which a classification can be based. If it is a crime to teach a certain religious dogma to the children who attend public schools, it is no less a crime to teach that dogma to the children who attend private schools or no school: and a statute which under the plea of safeguarding the religious welfare of children, makes a crime of one but not of the other, is violative of the constitutional guarantee of equality. No argument seems needed to establish so plain a proposition. Would anyone contend that, under the plea of guarding the moral welfare of children, a statute could be passed making it a crime to distribute obscene literature to children attending public schools, but no crime to distribute such literature to children attending private schools or no school? Would any lawyer have the

boldness to argue that the unlawful killing of a human being with malice aforethought should be murder in some designated part of the state but not in others—murder, for instance, everywhere save in the mountain regions, where the system of hereditary feuds is said still to prevail?"

Mr. Bryan contended that "the state can . . . forbid anything manifestly inimical to the public welfare." But, as pointed out by Mr. Delmas, this proposition assumes, without argument or presentation of evidence, that religious and public welfare are identical, and that therefore it is the right and even the duty of the state to guard religious welfare.

"But is this true? What is meant by religious welfare? It is assumed to consist in conserving belief in the sound dogmas of religion, and debarring belief in the unsound. What, then, are the sound and what the unsound dogmas? Is the dogma of the Trinity, a tenet of the Nicene creed, taught for sixteen hundred years in Christian churches, unsound? The Unitarians—and among them many of the noblest intellects and loftiest characters of our country—so hold. Is the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope, promulgated by the Catholic church as an article of faith, unsound? The Protestant world so holds. Is the dogma of the divinity of Christ, the keystone of the Christian arch, unsound? The Jews have so held for twenty centuries, and to this day so hold.

"If, in the discharge of its duty to guard religious welfare, the state is called upon to deal with these dogmas, what shall it do? Its duty, it is asserted, is to foster belief in the sound and hinder it in the unsound. How, then, shall it distinguish the one from the other? Where shall it find the guide to lead it through the chaos of doctrine—'Chaos of ruins, where all is doubly night'? . . .

"The simple truth is that religion is a realm lying outside the state's domain, and separated from it by an impassable gulf. With the events transpiring in that realm the state has no

more concern than it has with the domestic affairs of a foreign empire. In that realm, forms of worship may come to light, and may vanish; cults may flourish and may decay; systems of religion may be born and may die:—the state contemplates the changing panorama of religious vicissitudes in the attitude of an impassive looker-on. The reason is obvious. The religious condition, or if that term be preferred, the religious welfare, whatever that may mean, of the people was never entrusted to the state. Their civil welfare alone was placed in its keeping."

So far as I have been able to ascertain, none of the teachers in the tax-supported schools or colleges of Tennessee (with the technical exception of Scopes) has as yet been attacked under the law which made the Bible (in a negative sense, at least) an official text-book on science in the state's educational institutions. As it is quite impossible, in our day and age, to teach science or many other subjects without the guidance of the theory of evolution, evolutionary teachings are being presented, by some professors as "the historical background."

"In assignments for outside reading," in one college, "the law has been entirely disregarded, while the lectures, at the most, only suggestively veil the most daring elements. In many instances the students have taken up, both in and out of the classes, the discussion of evolution, asking questions and debating the various points" (Martin Sothern, "Notes of a Tennessee Pariah," *The Haldeman-Julius Monthly*, October, 1926).

This, of course, makes it very pleasant for a "law-abiding" teacher!

It is amusing to note the glee of the anti-evolutionists in discovering a text-book (Peabody and Hunt's "Biol-

ogy and Human Welfare") which they say "does not teach evolution." As a matter of fact, it does teach evolution, though in a discreet manner. It says: "It is futile, therefore, to look for the primitive stock of the human species in any *existing* animal"—which is precisely what Darwin himself taught!

But if a certain eye-winking goes on in the higher public institutions of learning, such is not the case in the denominational colleges. In respect to Bethel College, in McKenzie, the Cumberland Presbyterian Board, of which the Rev. I. K. Floyd, of Dallas, is national moderator, keeps a watchful eye (or ear) on all that goes on in this Fundamentalist seat of "education." The first victim of their system of watchful waiting was Dr. Mabel F. Martin, who was obliged to refuse re-election in July, 1926.

As newspaper reports of such events are not always wholly reliable, Dr. Martin was asked to furnish me with an authoritative statement of her case. From a letter received in reply, the following highly interesting quotations are presented. They clearly reveal the "inner working" of Fundamentalist "educational" institutions.

"Last winter a teachers' agency wrote me about a possible vacancy at Bethel. Having read all about the Scopes case, I naturally hesitated to apply for a position in Tennessee, without making sure that my employers understood my position on the question of evolution from the outset. I therefore explained my views to the president as carefully as possible, saying that I could not conscientiously accept a position where I was not free to teach or at least take for granted certain aspects of the theory of evolution.

"Apparently I did not succeed in making my position clear

to him, but from what he wrote me I thought that he and the other college authorities would understand where I stood on the question and that there would be no trouble. I was engaged to teach in a special summer quarter from April 21st to June 17th, with the possibility of remaining longer.

"During my entire stay at Bethel, there was, so far as I know, no adverse criticism of anything that I taught in the class-room or of any book that I used, though most of the books used were frankly written from an evolutionary standpoint. I did not refer to the question in class as a controversial issue, except in one lecture given toward the close of my course in biology. In other classes, I tacitly took it for granted. In all my courses I tried to stress the points which might be of practical value to my students, most of whom were young public school teachers. Almost without exception these students were appreciative and enthusiastic.

"Though I understood that the president was at least tolerant on the question of evolution, I was prepared to find the people in general narrow and bigoted. My first impression was one of agreeable surprise. As a scholar I was treated with respect and my opinion was asked by faculty, students, and townspeople with regard to many subjects in which I made no claim to superior knowledge. Several of the students seemed to enjoy engaging me in argument, but my views seemed to arouse no antagonism, no matter how radically they differed from those of the people with whom I was conversing. Rather, they seemed to waken curiosity and stimulate further questioning. . . .

" 'Dr. Martin,' I would be asked, 'you believe in evolution, don't you?'

" 'Yes, practically all scholars who have had any scientific training accept the theory of evolution, at least as a working hypothesis.'

" 'Then you don't believe in the Bible, do you?'

" 'Yes, I believe that the Bible is a great collection of ancient literature.'

" 'But you don't think it's all true,' the student would insist.

" 'Not literally. I think some of the stories admit of figurative interpretation.'

" 'Didn't you write the president,' one of the senior boys once asked me, 'that you saw no incompatibility between science and the Bible?'

" 'There is no incompatibility between science and a reasonable interpretation of the Bible. They deal with entirely different fields of thought.'

" 'I saw one of your letters to the president,' this student continued to my surprise, for though I had rather expected my business correspondence to be shown to the Board of Education and other responsible parties, I had not thought it would be shown to students. I had, however, not the slightest objection to this, and answered the young man's questions freely and frankly. . . .

"A few were disposed to laugh at evolution in terms that showed that they did not quite know what it was about. Others wanted to argue the question. I did not have the slightest desire to argue, for I did not care to convert anybody. But when students showed intelligent and respectful curiosity, I felt that they were entitled to accurate information, and I loaned my library freely. . . .

"The annual college revival threw some light on the situation. I have so many uncomplimentary things to say about the preacher that it is only fair to state at the outset that he was a good old man, kindly, warm-hearted, good-natured, and absolutely sincere. . . . [But] he was narrowly sectarian; he managed to get in several offensive slurs at other denominations. [And] he was rabidly unscientific. I should blush to quote some of the things he said about scientists. For example, he told his horrified congregation that the late Luther Burbank was in hell before he was in his coffin. This seemed a stupid attitude to take toward a man whose whole life had been devoted to benefiting humanity. . . . He painted an old-fashioned Hell in lurid colors, and intimated that no one could escape it solely by good works and moral life. The only way of escape was by public profession of belief in certain Fundamentalist doctrines. . . .

"Several of the men in the preaching profession proved surprisingly tolerant. Some even begged me not to judge the state of Tennessee by the anti-evolution law, which they said was not representative of the best people. This tempted me to say what I thought of the law, and of interference with academic freedom in general. My remarks on this subject were always received good-naturedly.

"Some of the students, after inquiring my views on various scientific, philosophical, and theological questions, asked, 'How did you manage to sign the creedal statement?'

" 'What creedal statement?' I asked.

" 'The one you had to sign in order to teach here,' was the answer.

" 'Nobody told me anything about any creedal statement,' said I. . . .

"On April 29th, the Secretary of the Board of Education (corresponding to the board of trustees in an ordinary college or university) wrote me that I had been re-elected and said, 'Formal agreement will be forwarded as soon as possible.' There was nothing in this letter about any creedal statement. I wrote the Secretary that I would accept the position, and also wrote to the teachers' agency from whom I had received the first notice of a possible vacancy, and paid them a commission on the estimated salary. In consultation with the college officials my work for the coming year was planned, and I regarded everything as settled. Naturally I thought that the students' talk about a creedal statement was either a mistake or a joke."

Dr. Martin then tells how a member of the Board finally told her that such a statement must be signed before her appointment could be confirmed, and how she refused to do so, as being against her principles and convictions.

"I took the matter up with the college officials, the president and the dean. Each expressed surprise that I had not been

previously informed about the creedal statement, and each tried to persuade me that it could be liberally interpreted to square with the beliefs which I actually held. Both of them had been helpful in many ways. It was a pleasure to work under them, and I would have done almost anything to repay their kindnesses to me, but for conscientious reasons, I refused to sign a statement of the kind.

"On June 20th, the formal contract, promised April 29th, was sent, and with it the creedal statement. I refused to sign, and gave up hope of returning to Bethel. This decision was known to the dean, the president, and one or two members of the board. I did not see fit to discuss it with the college in general. I wish now that I had made my refusal perfectly public at once, because this might have prevented a few misunderstandings which occurred later. . . .

"I continued to teach at Bethel after I was reported to have resigned, and completed my original contract. I voluntarily refused to sign my contract for reappointment, because I did not believe everything in the creedal statement which the other teachers had already signed."

Teachers of science who contemplate applying for a position in a denominational college of the Fundamentalist sort—and students of current history—will doubtless find the Bethel College Creedal Statement interesting and suggestive reading. (Quoted from *The Cumberland Presbyterian Bulletin*, McKenzie, Tennessee, April 30, 1926.)

"In view of the fact that some sister Protestant denominations find themselves to-day confronted with a spirit of anti-Christ—a denial of the fundamentals of the gospel, so powerful as to threaten their disruption; and since this alarming prevalence of heresy in them resulted from a quiet tolerance of a degree of heresy during many years, we think it but ordinary prudence and plain duty, that, no matter how limited this ungodly spirit may be at this time in our Church, we should profit

by the experience of others, and by the admonition of the Word of God, by adopting precautionary measures of protection against it. Therefore, we recommend that hereafter all who are employed as teachers in our schools shall subscribe to the following avowal of hearty acceptance of the fundamentals of the Gospel, to-wit:

"I accept and believe the Bible account of Creation as the direct act of God; the Bible record of miracles; the immediate and infallible inspiration of the Holy Scriptures as the very Word of God; that Jesus Christ was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, and was the only begotten Son of God; and that he came from heaven to die as an atonement for sin; that he was crucified and died, and the third day arose from the dead by a bodily resurrection; that he ascended to heaven, from whence he will in due time return again. I believe, further, that heart repentance toward God and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ being spiritual regeneration, without which the accountable soul cannot be saved. As a teacher I will, without compromise, steadfastly stand for these fundamental things, and actively resist every encroachment upon them within my sphere of service.

"I heartily subscribe to and accept the above statement, and will fully co-operate with the General Assembly's instructions in this matter."

Tennessee's anti-evolution law has now been in force for nearly two years. What effect has this Fundamentalist legislation had upon the schools of the state? Judge Neal has answered this question through Science Service (*Science*, April 9, 1926):

"The appalling effect of the anti-evolution law in Tennessee is written in the anxious faces of every science teacher in the high schools and the state university. At least to these individuals it has ceased to be a joke and become a terrible reality, for the following reasons:

"In the first place, immediately after the passage of the law,

the Text-Book Commission of the state, of which the governor is the head, either deleted the science text-books of all references to evolution, or selected new science books of an inferior character because they contained no references to evolution. The teachers were informed that unless they made sole use of these inferior text-books they would be dismissed and prosecuted under the anti-evolution law.

"Second, I have been informed by numerous science teachers that almost every recitation has become a trying ordeal on account of the necessity of avoiding the questions asked either innocently or designedly by the students, the proper answer to which would lead to a discussion of evolution.

"Thirdly, the public announcement of Boards of Education and Superintendents of Public Instruction that no teachers will be employed or retained who do not satisfy them that they will not only not teach evolution *but that they do not believe in evolution.* As a result many timid teachers are becoming fearful of discussing scientific subjects even in private conversations.

"An ominous silence continues to brood over the university. The president of the university and the administrative authorities refuse to answer queries of newspapers as to whether the anti-evolution law has necessitated changes in text-books and methods of teaching science. . . . If they should say yes they realize they would receive the contempt and ridicule of the scientific world; if they say no, they subject themselves to criminal prosecution. Discontent and dissatisfaction among the student body, however, is becoming more apparent every day. The intelligent and ambitious student who desires later to pursue professional courses in the larger eastern and northern universities is becoming apprehensive that his credits in science will not be accepted by these institutions."

As to the possibility of the repeal of the anti-evolution law by the next Legislature, Judge Neal states that there is no chance unless public opinion is enormously changed. He was himself a candidate for governor with

repeal of the law as a plank in his platform, but no one, including himself, expected him to be elected. In the primaries, August, 1926, Judge Neal was third in the contest, and Governor Peay was renominated, and re-elected by a wide margin.

"The press of the state as a whole," said Judge Neal, "have given no assistance whatever to those who have led the fight against the bill. [Though there have, of course, been exceptions to this.]

"The sole hope of any immediate relief lies in the possibility of securing in the Scopes case a decision of the Supreme Court of Tennessee to the effect that the act is unconstitutional."

However, on January 15, 1927, the Supreme Court of Tennessee, Judge McKinney dissenting, ruled just the opposite. The decision upheld the constitutionality of the law, but reversed the judgment against Scopes, on the ground that under the state constitution a fine of more than $50 can be assessed only by a jury, whereas Scopes was fined by the judge. A *nolle prosequi* was entered in the case, with the object of preventing retrial of Scopes or appeal to the United States Supreme Court, and thus "prolonging the life of this bizarre case," to quote Chief Justice Green. Judge Chambliss offered a separate, concurring opinion asserting that the teaching of "materialistic evolution" only was forbidden by the law.

Judge McKinney held that the statute was invalid "for uncertainty of meaning." The majority decision read:

"As the law thus stands, while the theory of the evolution of man may not be taught in the schools of the state, nothing contrary to that theory is required to be taught. It could scarcely be said that the statutory scriptural reading would amount to teaching of a contrary theory [?]. Our school authorities are,

therefore, quite free to determine how they shall act in this state of the law, and this course of study [biology] may be entirely omitted from the curriculum of our schools."

A very easy way out, and of a piece with the august permission given Scopes to advocate evolution on the street-corners, but not in the schools!

Although dismissal of the case, requested by the Attorney General, was thus concurred in by the Supreme Court, it was not formally placed on the minutes of the tribunal at Knoxville, from which grand division point the case was transferred to Nashville. Therefore the defense attorneys, by agreement with the Attorney General, L. D. Smith, announced that they would file a motion for a rehearing, and would meanwhile work for repeal of the law. Up to this writing no further action has been taken. Henry E. Colton, counsel for the Tennessee Academy of Sciences, agrees with Judge Chambliss that the law cannot now be violated except by the teaching of "materialistic or atheistic evolution."

On February 10, the Educational Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, meeting in Memphis, went on record with the statement that "legislation which would interfere with the proper teaching of science in American schools and colleges is futile and can serve no good." The measure was introduced by Dr. W. P. Few, president of Duke University, a Modernist. It was contended that the teaching of evolution did no harm to Christian doctrine liberally construed. Dr. G. F. Winfield, president of the association and also of Lon Morris College, Texas, said:

"Studying the results of scientific research will do no harm, for wherever you go, in science or theology, you'll find Christ."

As companion documents, it would be well to think over the two following legal indictments—brought into juxtaposition by Edward Meeman during the course of the Scopes trial:

In 1633 one Galileo was indicted by the Inquisition, the indictment setting forth:

"Whereas you, Galileo, son of the late Vincenzo Galileo of Florence, aged 70 years, were denounced in 1615 to this Holy Office for holding as true the false doctrine held by many—namely, that the sun is immovable in the center of the world and that the earth moves and also with a diurnal motion; also for having pupils whom you instructed in the same opinions; also for maintaining a correspondence on the same with some German mathematicians; also for publishing certain letters on the solar spots in which you developed the same doctrine as truth; also for answering the objections which were continually produced from the Holy Scriptures by glozing the said Scriptures according to your own meaning; and, whereas, thereupon was produced a copy of a writ-

In 1925 one Scopes was indicted by a Rhea county (Tennessee) grand jury, the indictment setting forth:

"That John Thomas Scopes, heretofore on the 24th day of April, 1925, did unlawfully, willfully, teach in the public schools of Rhea county, Tennessee, which said public schools are supported in part and in whole [*sic*] by the public school fund of the state, certain theory and theories that deny the story of the Divine Creation of man as taught in the Bible, and did teach instead thereof that man has descended from a lower order of animals, he, the said John Thomas Scopes, being at the time, and prior thereto, a teacher in the public schools of Rhea county,

ing in form of a letter confessedly written by you to a person formerly your pupil, in which, following the hypothesis of Copernicus, you include several propositions contrary to the true sense and authority of the Holy Scripture;

"Therefore, this holy tribunal, being desirous of providing against the disorder and mischief thence proceeding and increasing to the detriment of the holy faith, etc., etc. The two propositions of the stability of the sun, and the motion of the earth, were qualified . . . as follows:

"The proposition that the sun is the center of the world and immovable from its place is absurd philosophically, false and formally heretical because it is expressly contrary to the Holy Scripture.

"The proposition that the earth is not the center of the world nor immovable but that it moves also with a diurnal motion is also absurd, philosophically false, and, theologically considered, at least erroneous in faith."

Tennessee, aforesaid, against the peace and dignity of the state."

These two documents bring home to one quite vividly the shadow of the New Dark Age into which we may veritably be plunging!

Dr. Charles Francis Potter reminds us that:

"It is not only the Tennessee people who should be ashamed; we are all to blame. The educated and enlightened Americans who merely exclaim at such exalted ignorance should themselves awake and determine not to rest until the possibility of such dense mental darkness is removed."

CHAPTER VII

DECIVILIZING CALIFORNIA

HEN four hundred delegates to the Fourth Annual Convention of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association met in Los Angeles on July 1, 1922, and resolved to "wage a relentless warfare on Evolution and Modernism" and on text-books and teachers that "attempt to undermine the Christion faith" by expounding the modern doctrine of evolution, no one outside of Fundamentalist circles paid any attention to them. Their resolutions were taken as a joke, unworthy the serious attention of persons versed in the Higher Criticism or in the results of present-day science. The "man in the street" was, of course, not in any way interested.

Two years later, however, things looked different to thoughtful citizens—and also to the California State Board of Education.

The war on science in California first took on a serious aspect in July, 1924, when a group of Fundamentalists protested to the State Board of Education against the use in the high schools and junior colleges of text-books teaching evolution, on the ground that "Darwinism is clearly subversive to Christianity."

As to just when and where it became lawful for a State Board of Education, a purely secular institution, to

eliminate science from the public schools in order to defend the theological beliefs of any group of citizens, this has not yet been revealed. One ignorant clergyman —the word "ignorant" is used advisedly—made the assertion that "scientific statements on the descent of man and survival of the fittest are simply camouflage for infidelity." Infidelity to what, or to whom? What have the findings of scientific research to do with "infidelity"? The only form of "infidelity" open to the scientist is precisely the form demanded by the Fundamentalist, namely, suppression of facts in the interest of theology —in this instance, of a particular brand of theology. The word "infidel" occurs twice in the Bible, and is there used much as defined by Ambrose Bierce: "In New York, one who does not believe in the Christian religion; in Constantinople, one who does." Or, as Huxley said, "Infidel is a term of reproach which Christians and Mohammedans, in their modesty, agree to apply to those who differ from them."

On April 3, 1925, a large number of "resolutions" from Fundamentalist clergymen and churches were read before the State Board of Education; but a brief from the president of the Science League of America was neither mentioned nor read. The subservient board—not one of whom had any training in natural science—then and there, without discussion, passed a resolution that high school teachers might continue to teach evolution "as a theory but not as an established fact." On what ground, it might be asked, did this group of politicians decree that evolution could not be taught as "an established fact"?

The men who wrote and submitted the adverse "reso-

lution" were all debarred, automatically, by their self-imposed "creed," from taking part in any discussion based upon the findings of modern science. Their "science" is of ancient Babylonia, Chaldea, Persia, and Egypt, and their "authority" is of nations long buried in the desert sands.

There is, indeed, a "theory of evolution"—in fact, there are numerous theories of evolution. But there is also the *fact* of evolution, about which the scientists of the world are in complete agreement. By what legal or moral right, then, does a committee of non-scientists issue a State Ukase against teaching evolution as a fact—as a recognized process of nature? Prof. James Graham Kerr, in his presidential address before the zoology section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, at Oxford, England (August, 1926), in speaking of "the great fact of evolution," said:

> "We still see with tiresome frequency in magazine articles the statement that evolution is not a fact, but merely an unproved hypothesis. No doubt it may be said with perfect accuracy that in one sense absolute proof is unknown to science, except in relation to successive steps of an operation in pure mathematics. Taking, however, the word 'proved' as we use it in ordinary life, e. g., in relation to a matter inquired into by a court of law, then we are completely justified by the data of embryology and palaeontology in stating that evolution is a definitely proved fact. The realization that it is a fact admitted by all competent judges should be incorporated in the mental equipment of every citizen at an early stage of his training."

Prof. Edwin Linton recently pointed out (*Science*, November 26, 1926) that:

"The term evolution is a convenient name for the processes of nature which we see going on about us, and of which we are a part, of which also a partial record is preserved in the earth's crust, and elsewhere in the visible universe. It is only when an attempt is made to explain how any particular thing comes to be as it is that any theory of evolution is introduced."

But the non-scientific California State Board of Education arbitrarily decreed, at the behest of a particular group of religionists, that the *facts* regarding the origin and evolution of plant and animal life shall be presented *as a theory!* These Fundamentalists demanded, furthermore, that a number of the state's text-books in natural science be eliminated, as being out of harmony with the traditions of the ancient Orient.

Compliant to the last, the Board referred twelve text-books in general science, biology, zoology and astronomy, to a committee composed of the presidents of nine California universities, six of them under denominational control. The chairman was Dr. W. W. Campbell, president of the University of California and noted astronomer. The committee's conclusion was as follows:

"The theory of evolution, in one or another of its phases, is referred to in these books,—it could scarcely be omitted from any text-book on biology, or astronomy, or geology,—and in a few of the books some of the evidence in support of the theory of evolution is presented. In our opinion, these books have treated the subject with moderation and circumspection. There appear to be no statements derogatory to the Bible, and in the few instances in which the possible bearing of evolution upon religion is discussed at all, the writers have taken special pains to assure the readers that there is no conflict between

science and religion. Evolution is presented as a theory and not as an established fact, although it is stated here and there that the theory of evolution is commonly accepted by scientific men, and that it is true. . . .

"The text-books before us are concerned with presenting scientific facts and theories of which every person with any pretense to an education in the subject or subjects treated should be informed. All departures of the authors from this simple policy may be said to show due respect and consideration for the fundamental principles of religion, as presented in the Bible."

The Baptist Temple News (Detroit, April 18, 1925) had this to say anent the California situation:

"Of course anyone with ordinary sense could foresee, as the Board of Education foresaw, that the verdict of the nine presidents [would be] favorable to the teaching of evolution in the schools. Thus the evolutionists have entrenched themselves in the schools. Some of these presidents admitted that while evolution is a theory and not science [?] yet the majority of scientists teach it as science. Some of them have felt obliged to explain their decision to their patrons by saying that they were not asked if they were evolutionists, they were only asked to decide about the text-books, and they found the text-books giving out evolution in sufficiently small quantities, so that it would not produce infidelity and irreverence. Now let us suppose these nine presidents were asked to decide whether poisons were deadly, and whether the packages dealt out to the public should not be labelled 'poison,' and decorated with death's head and crossbones, and their verdict should be, 'Poisons are not deadly when taken in small quantities, and hence there is no call for labels or decorations.' Would not their patrons wonder a little about their sanity? Then as an explanation they would say, 'We were not asked whether we took poison, we were just asked whether it was deadly.' What a world we live in!"

The report itself, of course, affords an adequate answer to such childish babble. Among sensible persons an antidote to ignorance and superstition is not usually thought of as a "poison." The answer of the nine educators was simply that the text-books examined presented some of the more important facts upon which evolutionists base their interpretations of the evolutionary process in nature. The committee added that, in the preparation of the texts, due care was taken by the writers to avoid giving needless offense to those who venerate tradition more than facts. It was implied that the discoveries of modern science—verified knowledge—were presented as facts, while the explanation of evolution, the attempt to account for the observed facts, is taught as a theory.

The Sierra Educational News (San Francisco) took strong exception to the action of the Board of Education in referring the question of text-books legally under their control to persons in no way officially connected with the question at issue:

"Having before them," says Vaughn MacCaughey, the editor of this journal, "the arguments of both evolutionists and anti-evolutionists, and having listened to the complaints lodged against the text-books, the State Board does a remarkable thing. That body turns the entire matter over to the presidents of those colleges and universities qualified under the law to train teachers for the public school service in California. Why pass the responsibility or side-step the issue?

"This is not a question of church or religion. Neither school board nor university commission nor other individual or tribunal may pass upon the scriptural interpretation or religious belief for the rest of us. It would be futile and inexcusable to debate the questions held sacred by Fundamentalist or Rationalist and no decision reached by any court or commission

would convince either side to that controversy that its view is untenable.

"We hold no brief for the State Board of Education. We have no shadow of criticism for the heads of our higher institutions of learning. But if the merits of such an issue as the one under discussion and raised primarily in relation to the text-books in the public schools cannot be decided by the State Board, why should the Board have any voice whatever in the selection of text-books for the public schools?"

(In order to make assurance doubly sure, apparently, the State Assembly on March 26, 1926, passed a measure, by a majority of forty-four votes, giving authority to the State Board of Education to eliminate from text-books for schools any matter which they might deem objectionable.)

A review of the text-books used in the public schools of California, made in July, 1924, revealed the fact that about fifty text-books would have to be eliminated from the public schools if the demands of the Fundamentalists were complied with. All of these books were based on an assumption of the validity of the theory of evolution —upon the assumption that the *process* of evolution is a fact. One book—Moon's "Biology for Beginners"—reproduces an *hypothetical* ancestral tree of life—not as a "fact," but as a theoretical induction. Man is shown at the apex of the phylogenetic chart, but his root—or stem—relations with the anthropoid apes are also indicated.

Gruenberg's "Elementary Biology," after giving the evidence for transformism (evolution) so far as known, says: "Of the origin of life, science knows nothing." Fervid exception was taken to this phrase, both by the Fundamentalists and by a Roman Catholic member of

the Board of Education. For how can we say, they argued, that we know nothing about the origin of life when the Bible tells us all about it?

Lest some misapprehension arise in the reader's mind because of the mention above of the objecting Board member, it is necessary to add here (supplementing remarks in the Introduction) that the Roman Catholic Church as yet has taken no official stand on the current war on evolution. The Protestant Fundamentalists are more ultramontane on this subject than the Pope himself. Father McHugh, of San Francisco, called attention to the fact that evolution as a theory is taught in parochial schools of the state:

> "Though no definite book is prescribed, and the schools are allowed to choose their own, they all teach evolution as an hypothesis. We make a distinction between a scientific question and moral philosophy. As yet, [we hold that] there are not sufficient facts proved to say that evolution is a fact.
>
> "We hold that God is necessary. We demand the interference of a personal God as the first cause of life. When creation took place is another matter."

Moreover, in Roman Catholic colleges, non-Catholic teachers of biology are often employed, and they teach evolution freely.

It should be stated, however, that in spite of the views of certain Roman Catholic priests and laymen, and in spite of the rather liberal attitude of the Catholic Encyclopaedia, the majority of Catholic priests seems to be opposed to the teaching of evolution and most of the adherents of the church would probably vote for an anti-evolution law. The then president of Santa Clara University, Father Zaccheus Maher, addressed an anti-evolution

meeting in San Francisco, under the auspices of the Holy Name Society; the Paulist Fathers also held a week of anti-evolution lectures by one Father Kavanaugh in San Francisco in the spring of 1926. Several of the same order have written books, with the official *imprimatur*, denouncing evolution.

However, an entire church (Catholic any more than Protestant) need not be indicted for the sake of some of its representatives; and we must not forget that most of the members of the Ku Klux Klan and all the Protestant Fundamentalists, rather than Catholic writers, are the really voluble and aggressive warriors against the teaching of evolution. *Signs of the Times* even prints advertisements of Catholic anti-evolution books in its Seventh Day Adventist (and anti-Catholic) pages!

On March 15, 1925, the Science League of America wrote to the California State Board of Education denying

> "the legal or moral right of any organization, or individuals, to interfere, *on religious grounds*, in any manner whatsoever with the educational institutions of the state, or with the duties of the State Board of Education; our tax-supported schools and colleges being legally purely secular institutions."

The report of the college presidents having proved unsatisfactory to them, the Fundamentalists then made another attempt to force the board to refuse endorsement of the text-books under consideration. A delegation of Fundamentalists from various sections of the state and elsewhere demanded a hearing on this issue at a regular meeting of the board. Many briefs and resolutions were received and accepted calling upon the members to

eliminate evolution from the schools under their control; among them one from the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Riverside, demanding that evolution be outlawed from every school "supported or partially supported from public funds."

A second brief presented at this time by the Science League of America emphasized the fact that the question of whether the findings of science were in harmony with the cosmological, geological, biological or anthropological conceptions of the peoples of antiquity could not properly or lawfully be a question for educators and scientists to consider in selecting text-books for our tax-supported educational institutions; such schools, colleges and universities being purely secular in origin and nature. It was contended that objections to any text-books used in our schools, if raised solely on religious grounds, or inspired by theological preconceptions, could only be regarded as irrelevant, and should be wholly ignored, as an attempted invasion of our secular institutions by sectarian religious bodies—a thinly veiled attempt at union (or at least partial union) of Church and State. The Science League insisted that text-books should be selected by competent experts in the subjects treated, and with regard only to their merits from the scientific viewpoint.

The action of the board in ruling that evolution may be taught "merely as a theory" in California has been construed by some city superintendents as applying even to private conversations of teachers and pupils. Below is a copy of a letter in witness of this fact, sent to the Board of Education of Long Beach on May 11, 1925, by W. L. Stephens, Superintendent of Schools:

"Recommendations of the Superintendent: That the superintendent be authorized and directed to inform the teaching staff of the city schools of the wish of the Board of Education to the effect that the ruling of the State Board of Education relating to the teaching of evolution shall be followed. This ruling of the State Board provides that evolution shall be taught in the public schools of California as a theory only.

"It is the further wish of the local Board of Education that this attitude of the teaching staff be maintained not only in class-room instruction, but also in private consultation or conversation between teacher and pupil."

In Los Angeles an organization was formed under the misnomer, "Defenders of Science versus Speculation." Dr. W. B. Riley said of it (*Baptist Temple News*, April 18, 1925):

"We believe if the Los Angeles men who formed the organization will give themselves to the task in hand, they can sweep evolution out of the schools, state and denominational. We are inclined to believe also that they could get back Bible reading into these same schools [However, an initiative measure to introduce Bible reading into the schools of California was defeated two to one at the November, 1926, election], but we question the desirability of this move unless the law replacing the Bible required its reading without comment, . . . for Modernist interpretation of the Bible is a destruction of the Bible itself."

The Fundamentalist demands eye-witness evidence for the truth of evolution, but he flies into a rage if one even asks him for proof that his Bible stories are inerrant. Dr. David Starr Jordan has remarked on this point:

"The same ground has been fought over again and again since the followers of Luther insisted that the Bible is one solid book, every line of it inspired and intended to give not merely

the spiritual ideals of various great men but also the astronomical, biological and historical truths in small doses, its casual statements not to be questioned or even verified by ages to come. *This is paganism revived* and the teachings of Jesus discredited."

To the same effect wrote Charles M. Sheldon, the editor-in-chief of *The Christian Herald,* New York City, in a contribution to *The Atlantic Monthly* (October, 1925, page 468):

"Jesus never said a word about evolution, about His own birth, about the absolute inerrancy of the Scriptures, about the necessity of consenting to a long doctrinal creed before one could be called a Christian and be saved. In His tremendous picture of the Last Judgment He based the final destiny of mankind on the way mankind had behaved, not on doctrinal or theological beliefs."

And Prof. Edwin Linton said (*Science,* February 19, 1926):

"Having in mind some of the 'fundamentals' of which St. Paul either had never heard, or at least did not think of sufficient importance to mention in any of his writings that have been preserved, I asked a member of the faculty of one of our best known theological seminaries, whom I chanced to meet last summer, what chance St. Paul would have of being received into a present-day Fundamentalist communion. His answer was, in effect, that he would not have a ghost of a chance."

If St. Paul couldn't qualify as a member of the "Defenders of Science versus Speculation," it is small wonder that such good men as Darwin and Huxley, along with all other evolutionists, are condemned as exponents, not of "science," but of "speculation"!

Billy Sunday said, in Los Angeles (and elsewhere) that "if a minister believes and teaches evolution, he is a stinking skunk and a liar." Again he said: "The consensus of scholarship can go to hell for all I care"; and again, "Old Darwin is in hell." (Cited by Charles T. Sprading, "Science versus Dogma," pages 144–5.)

During their convention in San Francisco, on July 28, 1925, more than 4,000 members of the International Walther League, representing the youth of the Lutheran Church, placed themselves on record as favoring outlawry of the teaching of evolutionary doctrine. A resolution was adopted, without a dissenting vote, denouncing "Modernism, liberalism, evolution and radicalism." This action followed a perfervid hour of oratory by the Rev. J. W. Behnken, of Houston, in which he asserted that "irresponsible teachers" in the higher schools of the United States are teaching evolution, and corrupting the youth of the nation with their "wild theories." He also announced that the purpose of the country's greatest scientists is "to hamper the peaceful and prosperous development" of this nation, and at last "to wipe out its peaceful institutions."

"The sad spectacle of boys and girls returning home entirely too smart for the religion of their parents," said Mr. Behnken, "gives you an idea of the chaos which exists without Christ."

The president of the Walther League, A. A. Grossman, classed evolution with Atheism and "Bolshevism." He said:

"The biggest service of the Walther League is to fight the current effort to deny Biblical truths and substitute man-made

theories. The youth of the church must return to the beliefs of their fathers if home and civilization are to endure."

The Rev. Earl Kretzschmar, of Fort Smith, Arkansas, was also worried about the safety of our free institutions, but boasted that "the Lutheran Church in this country is free from liberalism." (As we shall see, this is not entirely true.) Where a pastor is upheld in his liberalism by his congregation, "we are prepared to refuse them membership in the synodical conference of Lutherans." He was followed by the Rev. John H. C. Fritz of St. Louis, who declared that "if we cannot learn the great questions of time and eternity from the Bible, we cannot learn them from any other source, for who is the man who can tell us?"

In June, 1926, the evolutionists of California were placed "where they belong" by no less a person than Aimee Semple McPherson, "the queen evangelist of the City of Angels." In explanation of her sudden disappearance of thirty-five days, Mrs. McPherson announced that she had been kidnapped by direct order of the devil himself, and gave her opposition to evolution as one of the causes. *The Argonaut* (San Francisco) for July 3, 1925, remarked:

"Mrs. McPherson provided a more definite clue as to the identity of the abductors. Addressing a great throng gathered inside Angelus Temple, . . . she said that she had created formidable enemies by reason of her opposition to dancing, 'the dope ring,' the use of liquor, and the teaching of evolution. This last item is a hint that her abductors might be found among the evolutionists connected with . . . Stanford and the University of California."

To Fred Meyer, of Ojai (Ventura county), California, belongs the credit (?) of establishing a new method of poisoning the minds of the youth of the state with stupefying Fundamentalist dogma. Appointing himself as "head" of a camp of boys from his county, Meyer led them forth to a site in the General Grant Park, at the Fresno Y. M. C. A. campsite at Lake Sequoia. Below follow a few excerpts from the daily program:

"Next to the water sports the campfire is the most popular period of the camp. . . . Besides the group discussion, a question is asked the group each night as follows: . . . Evolution, are we ascending to God the Father, or are we descendants of a monkey?"

Fortunately, Ventura county has a wide-awake weekly paper, *The Ojai,* ably edited by Frank Gerard. So when the Fundamentalist Meyer sent in his glowing report of the boys' camp, of which he was the manager, Mr. Gerard did not hesitate to accompany Mr. Meyer's publicity by a strong denunciatory editorial, from which the following criticisms are quoted:

"We were more than astonished, we were appalled, to read in the article on the boys' camp up in the Grant National Park sent in by that great friend of boys, Fred Meyer, that one of the questions for discussion at their fireside meetings, was 'Evolution, are we ascending to God the Father, or are we descendants of a monkey?' The question is illustrative of the amazing ignorance and confusion of thought that has marked so much of this controversy over evolution. We can scarcely believe that anyone who assumed the terrific responsibility of shaping youthful minds should embark on such a subject with the lack of understanding disclosed in the question. The

propounder evidently starts off with the notion that the latter part of the question is some sort of alternative for the first part. He might just as well have asked the boys 'Do you believe it will be a wet day to-morrow, or do you believe that England will go dry at the next election?' As in the former question, a pair of false opposites is used, only more palpably so. There is no real connection between the parts of the sentence. Such a question as asked of these young campers could only come from one who was hopelessly confused as to the meaning of evolution and of the terms ascending and descending. To put such a muddled query before youthful minds would be a disgraceful procedure were it not mitigated by the certainty that the boys are not likely to take it very seriously. . . .

"We may gain a far grander idea of our own Godwardness should we some day discover that the aspiring spark of divinity within us had struggled up through those clumsy and inept bodies which we classify with such disdain as animals. The evidence that these forms, like our own, are themselves undergoing a gradual process of change and growth *as forms* need not prevent our perceiving that from the religious point of view, it is the *spirit* we are concerned with and *not the form it uses.*"

Truly Mr. Meyer has set a good example for all right-thinking Fundamentalists—i. e., capture or control not only of our educational institutions, legislatures, boards of education, places of amusement, magazines, the radio, etc., etc., but also of the camp-fires of youth! Soon these boys will be old enough to vote against "that old Serpent"—the theory of evolution.

In a speech at Mountain View, California, given under the auspices of the Seventh Day Adventists, Mr. Bryan said, in October, 1924:

"All the ills from which America suffers can be traced back

to the teaching of evolution. It would be better to destroy every other book ever written, and save just the first three verses of Genesis."

In similar vein, the San Joaquin Valley Baptist Association warned its people "against this hideous and faith-destroying movement," and called upon "all taxpayers to protest against the use of their money to undermine the Christian faith." It was urged that all Baptists on school boards should "use their influence against such teaching."

A press dispatch from Turlock, California (a small town in the San Joaquin Valley), dated August 4, 1925, says:

"The Bryan Bible League, formed 'to honor the memory of William J. Bryan and to continue the fight he so nobly began in opposing the teaching of evolution,' has been launched here at a mass meeting of over 2,500 persons. Leaders of the movement, headed by the Rev. Paul Rood of the local Mission Church, are to get in immediate touch with the widow of the late champion of Fundamentalism and with other leaders of the fight against evolution."

Another dispatch, dated Orland (a town in northern California), April 27th, states:

"Organization of an Orland unit of the Bryan Memorial League, pledged to aid in furthering the campaign against the teaching of evolution in the public schools, was announced here to-day following a mass meeting addressed by the Rev. Paul Rood of Turlock."

In the fall of 1925, the Rev. Robert Shuler, pastor of the Trinity Baptist Church, of Los Angeles, issued what he called "Our Ku Klux Number" of his magazine (*Bob*

Shuler's Magazine), the cover-page of which contained a list of "men of science" alleged to have rejected the theory of evolution. Referring to this Ku Klux and anti-evolution number of this magazine, *The Truth Seeker* (October 10, 1925) pertinently called attention to the fact that:

> "Some of the persons named are or were Catholics, some are unknown, some not scientists at all, and some misnamed or misspelled. A list that makes 'scientists' of Thomas Carlyle and John Ruskin might include all distinguished men of letters, every artist and poet, and could hardly keep out William Jennings Bryan. The *ignorance* of the compiler accounts for some of the names, and for the printing of St. George Mivart as 'Sir' George and of Tyndall as 'Tydall' [Tyndall, of course, was actually an evolutionist]; *dishonesty* could be charged in the use of the name of [the late] 'Prof. Bateson,' who is certainly no more an anti-evolutionist than was Herbert Spencer or John Fiske.
>
> "As *Shuler's Magazine* prints its list under the head of 'Our Ku Klux Number,' it is assumed that Ku Kluxers are anti [-evolutionist]s."

Fearful lest they be classed with the "infidel" evolutionists, the California Synod of the Presbyterian Church (which governs also the Presbyterian churches of Nevada), in session August 21, 1925, in Oakland, passed a resolution which deplored any teaching that created disbelief in the minds of students that the Bible is veritably the word of God. The Synod took the view that:

> "There is [*sic*] being taught by teachers who are not trained scientists [?] and who have no right to speak with any degree of finality, theories that make for blatant Agnosticism and a defiant Atheism."

The Synod's resolution was drawn up by Dr. G. A. Briegleb, retiring moderator, and pastor of the West Lake Presbyterian Church of Los Angeles. It scored "pseudo-scientists," and called upon boards of education and superintendents of schools in California and Nevada to ban "objectionable text-books" and forbid their use by teachers.

"We are emphatically opposed to such teaching in the name of science," it continued, "which, based upon a materialistic philosophy of life and an evolutionary hypothesis that has not yet been accepted by the world's best thinkers [!], ridicules the Bible as the word of God and the infallible rule of faith and practice and is utterly subversive of the reverence and respect which many of the fathers and mothers of California, through the Synod, have taught their children."

These intolerant and childish views of California Presbyterians are not in accord with those of the adult minds of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, as Bryan discovered, to his chagrin, in 1923, when he was defeated as candidate for moderator and still more decisively defeated in his fight on evolution—thanks to the strong stand taken by Dr. J. W. Baer, able leader of the fight on Bryan's position. The more intelligent Presbyterian ministers have taken the position for many years—and have frankly taught their congregations—that evolution is not necessarily anti-Christian. Possibly the ardent agitation of the anti-evolution zealots during the past few years is beginning to effect a change in the attitude of "the rank and file."

It is gratifying to be able to report that several large

religious bodies in California have gone on record as being strongly opposed to an ecclesiastical censorship of the teaching of evolution in California schools. On September 17, 1924, the Methodist Episcopal Church Conference, meeting in Santa Cruz, severely scored Fundamentalist attempts at throttling freedom in teaching. The Northern California Congregational Conference, at a meeting in Sacramento, August 25, 1925, representing twenty-five northern counties, endorsed the teaching of evolution in the high schools and colleges. The conference, in a letter to Will C. Wood, then State Superintendent of Public Instruction, expressed the hope that the State Board of Education would "be firm in its stand to permit the teaching of evolution, as a theory, in the public schools."

The Western Association of Jewish Ministers, in 1925, adopted resolutions urging the teaching of the theory of evolution in the educational institutions of the Golden State. In a letter to the State Board the Association said:

> "The teaching of evolution and science in the public schools is necessary for complete modern education. Any attempt to abrogate the freedom of scientific investigation and instruction should be combated with the utmost vigor in the name not only of science but of religion.
>
> "Biblical folklore is only incidental to the spiritual truths in the Bible. The stories of creation in the Book of Genesis are poems, not to be literally interpreted."

Dr. Rudolph I. Coffee, Rabbi of Temple Sinai, Oakland, formerly State Chaplain of California, and author of "Hebrew Cosmology," took the same view in a letter to me:

"It is unfortunate that the fight for truth must be waged without cessation. Sixty years ago, such leaders as Darwin, Wallace, Fiske and Huxley successfully, so it was then thought, proved once and for all time that the creation story as narrated in Genesis was no longer tenable. The latest findings of science, as evinced by the theory of evolution, clearly indicate the earth to be millions, not hundreds nor thousands of years old. Gladstone tried to reconcile these differences by saying that instead of a creation in six days, it was in six periods of a thousand years each. The Fundamentalists to-day are more certain, and they insist that the Genesis story is correct to the exclusion of all else.

"Of those who believe in the creation of the world theory as told in Genesis, I would ask which creation story, because there are two in the first chapters of the Bible. What is more, there is a third creation story to be found in Proverbs, Chapter VIII, and a fourth in Job, Chapter XXXVIII. And these are absolutely contradictory. For example, in Genesis, the sun, moon and stars were created on the fourth day. In Job, Verse 7, these heavenly bodies preceded the creation of the earth.

"Why not accept the Bible for what it was intended and what it is, the greatest spiritual storehouse in the world? There is nothing like it in all literature. The Bible is not a scientific treatise; it is not a kindergarten manual; it is not the last word in health regulations; and many of its rules were only intended for the Holy Land."

Prof. Laurence Cross, formerly of the University of Tennessee and now pastor of the Northbrae Community Church, a liberal non-sectarian church in Berkeley, said to the members of the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco:

"Like all liberals, I accept evolution. The reason there is not a bigger outcry against the strange attacks on evolution is that we are stricken dumb with amazement that any defense of

it is needed. The burden of proof rests upon the Fundamentalists, not upon science."

Another Berkeley pastor, Dr. Frank S. Brush, at a meeting of the Exchange Club (July 30, 1925), said that in the Fundamentalist contentions concerning the inimical nature of the theory of evolution he had not seen the name of a single first-class theologian, and that the principal schools of theology have accepted the theory of evolution years ago.

"The scientist is a humble man," declared Dr. Brush. "He is sincere in his search for truth and never dogmatizes. If you could bring a single fact which would absolutely disprove the theory of evolution the scientists would be the first to welcome it.

"When asked if he believed the sun goes around the earth Bryan was indignant. He affirmed his belief in the Copernican theory and declared he was an educated man. Had he been familiar with church history or had he recalled the incident if he knew it, he would realize that that same Copernican theory was once more vigorously attacked than evolution has been, and for the same reason. It was thought to be a menace to the integrity of the Bible."

The California members of the Unitarian Laymen's League (like their colleagues throughout the country) have unanimously supported the principle of freedom of teaching and non-interference by religious bodies in public school and college curricula. The Rev. E. Burdette Backus, pastor of the First Unitarian Church of Los Angeles, made the following strong statement regarding the war on freedom of teaching:

"In Hendrik Van Loon's very interesting book entitled 'Tolerance,' he has an analysis of the greatness of ancient Greece.

He says that there are many factors which contribute to the development of a great civilization, but that one of the most important of these is freedom and that it was the large measure of this indispensable freedom attained by the ancient Greeks which made possible their wonderful civilization. This judgment is confirmed by the English historian, Bury, who says that back there several centuries before the time of Christ, the mind of man broke loose from its fetters and achieved a degree of freedom such as it had never won before and has never known since except in our own day. The result of this freedom, he says, was that in a period of two centuries Greece gave to the world ten of the men who would have to be included in a list of the twenty greatest geniuses of all time.

"Contrariwise, those periods in human history when the mind of man has been enslaved by tyranny of one sort or another, be it political or ecclesiastical, have been the dark ages. . . . It is an illuminating commentary that our great progress in knowledge and scientific achievement coincides exactly with those centuries which have marked the loosening of the grip of ecclesiastical authority upon the mind of man. The great advance which we have made in the past three centuries has been possible only because of our increased measure of freedom.

"But as has been wisely said, 'Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.' The battles of freedom have by no means all been won. Mankind no sooner breaks one set of fetters with which it has been bound than it discovers that there are persons at work eagerly forging new chains with which to bind men's minds afresh. Over and over again must champions rise up to defend the cause of human freedom. Never was there greater need for such champions than at this present time. . . . Here a group is endeavoring to legislate what shall and what shall not be taught in our schools, as though it were possible to determine the truth by a vote of the people. . . . We must reassert the principle of freedom on which this government of ours was established and which we confirmed in the great war of emancipation. That freedom is essential to

fullness of life. It is a fundamental article of my religious faith."

The Rev. Theodore Curtis Abel, minister of the First Unitarian Church of Hollywood, and a valiant worker for freedom in teaching, has aptly remarked:

"The myth that the Bible is inspired in a sense that no other literature can be said to be inspired is directly responsible for the present-day fight against the teaching of science. This fight is a conflict of ideas—of the idea, on the one hand, that all worthwhile truth comes by revelation to those best fitted to receive it and that the Bible is such a revelation to those who possess the key to its proper interpretation, and the idea, on the other hand, that all truth awaits discovery by those who dare delve into and explore the regions of the unknown by accredited scientific methods. The fight can never cease so long as this myth of the inspired Bible lives.

"One of the most insidious dangers confronting the American principles of religious liberty and the separation of Church and State is to be found in the activities of the evangelical Christian churches in their program of religious week-day instruction. Here is a nation-wide attempt to instil the doctrines of evangelical Christianity into the minds of the school children. . . . It does not require a prophetic vision to see that if the encroachment of these church activities upon the time and work of the public schools is not checked, our American principle of free and religiously independent schools is doomed, and the teaching of the sciences will soon be a thing of the past."

Dr. Henry Frank, author of "The Doom of Dogma and the Triumph of Truth," and noted lecturer, in an article in *The San Diego Union* (December 17, 1925) said:

"It has been discovered by an unhappy experience that mere academic instruction, quietly and sincerely inculcated, will not

in itself save this nation from the pall of legalized ignorance which threatens to stifle it. The Fundamentalists are not contented to spread abroad their own interpretation of what they believe to be the truth, letting it meet whatever fate may befall it, but they are passionately resolved to superimpose upon the entire nation their own interpretation of nature by the binding and restrictive force of legislation.

"This is the direful menace. We are not at all concerned with what people may privately believe or disbelieve: that is their own affair, over which they alone should have supervision. But when the attempt is made in this republic to introduce political organizations into the arena of scholastic instruction, which shall fight for what retroactive or reactionary convictions they may espouse, then the time has come for every agency of light and truth and scientific knowledge to buckle on its armor and resist the mass offensive of blatant ignorance."

"No lasting harm was ever done by scoundrels," said Dr. Charles F. Lummis, famous historian of the Southwest.

"All wars, all religious persecutions," he continued, "are waged by God-fearing people who devoutly believe they are right. What makes them dangerous is when their ignorance equals their zeal. The hanging of the Puritan witches, the Spanish Inquisition, the mob that cried 'Crucify Him!' when the Man of Nazareth taught unfamiliar Truth—all this was the work of the Devout. To-day, the Fundamentalists do not realize that they threaten us with a return of Mediaevalism, a Union of Church and State which is contrary not only to the American Constitution, but to the whole genius of human intelligence to-day. But that is practically what they do threaten —and they are likely to put it over! The world has never seen a more astonishing organized attempt of Ignorance to dominate Education by Law. . . . The city of Zion, Illinois, by ordinance forces its schools to teach that the world is flat

'like a pie, surrounded by a circle of water, enclosed by an outer circle of impenetrable ice.' But Dowie never threatened to legislate the nation into his darkness. . . .

"Don't underestimate the danger. Grotesque as this ignorance seems to educated people, it is epidemic. Above all, it is Organized—and actively recruiting every hour in every State. The Christian Fundamentals Association is vowed 'never to rest until it drives, by law, the teaching of evolution out of every school supported by public funds.' There is a great force of able fanatics in the saddle, rallying the multitudes who naturally drift with the majority, and the conventional. If a popular vote were taken to-morrow, the Fundamentalists would sweep the country, put the Bryan amendment in the Constitution, and put this nation back in the Dark Ages, robbed of the Intellectual Freedom which is its cornerstone. Legislature after legislature will be besieged, bullied, blackmailed. Unless Those Who Know Better awaken and act, the blame will be theirs rather than that of the bigots."

It is gratifying to be able to state that in June, 1925, delegates representing 100,000 students of western colleges and universities pledged themselves to oppose the enactment of laws preventing the teaching of evolution, and declared that the anti-evolutionists are a menace to education and enlightenment. The conference, which was held at the University of California, by the National Student Federation of America, appointed committees to prepare and submit a national program.

Speaking as president of the Santa Barbara County Branch of the American Association for Medical Progress, Inc., George E. Coleman, bacteriologist, and recently elected Secretary-Treasurer of the Science League of America, made a strong plea for the more general study of biology—including evolution.

"A man may have," said Mr. Coleman, "a liberal education in religion, politics, economics, art, or in any other subject, but unless he has more than a smattering of biology, the study of life's processes, he will never be able to interpret life—that is, human life—in its various phases nor give his best aid to its natural evolution toward the destiny that it was intended to fulfill. It is not enough to be endowed by one's ancestors with intelligence. Intelligence without a liberal education in science as well as in other subjects may be a real menace. In my opinion, there is nothing so dangerous nor so destructive to human progress, spiritual or material, and especially to medical progress, as ignorance of science in intelligent people.

"The education of our children in biology and in other sciences, especially as they affect our personal happiness and bodily welfare, is of the greatest importance. 'Life is not a passive and empty thing.' It leads somewhere. Just where it will lead the human race we do not know, but if its processes are guided by a proper attitude toward the teachings of science and these truths followed fearlessly wherever they may lead, it is quite within the bounds of possibility that disease may be banished forever from the human race and on this planet a future destiny unfolded for higher life, both physical and mental, undreamed of and even inconceivable in the light of our present inadequate knowledge.

"I am making this special plea for a wider study of biology . . . because of the opposition that we research workers constantly encounter by those who disbelieve in our methods of investigation, the results obtained and the practical application of those results by our physicians and public health workers."

Such was the state of the evolution battle in California when the State Board of Education opened its meeting in July, 1925, this time in San Francisco. Here the Fundamentalist war on modern science was renewed with added zeal and determination. The original con-

tention that "evolution should not be taught as a fact, but merely as a theory" having been conceded by the board, the next—and logical—demand was that evolution should not be taught at all; as witness a resolution submitted by a group of Fundamentalists:

"Evolution is in no sense a science. After 3,000 years of discussion [?] it is confessedly without demonstration, and *false to all the facts thus far discovered.* But it is *essentially a religion.* It essays to account for the universe, the earth and all life on it, including man, body, soul, and spirit; and, of course, is as certainly an atheistic religion as Christianity is a theistic one. . . . We record with you our deliberate judgment that the State Board dare [!] not permit the continuation of this opposing and atheistic *faith* [All italics mine].

"And we request that the State Board not only remove from its courses of study books that teach that evolution is a science, but that this be done also with *books that set it forth as a theory,* since a *theory that cannot be proved* in the course of 3,000 years should, in the interest of truth and higher education, be once and for all abandoned; and particularly do we insist upon this course for our great State, in view of the *known consequences* of this false philosophy, namely, that it does violence to well established natural laws, is out of harmony with the world of life about us, *as well as the fossil world beneath us;* that it tends to Atheism, Bolshevism, Socialism and even to Anarchy, as historically demonstrated in those countries where it has been *tested and proven* [though it 'cannot be proved']."

Telegrams were received by the board from the city of Glendale (a suburb of Los Angeles), from the Lincoln Avenue Presbyterian Church of Pasadena, and from the Tremont Baptist Church of Pasadena, all demanding that "all texts teaching other theories of the origin of man than that in the Bible be barred from the tax-

supported schools of the state." The Baptist church denounced evolution as "at once unscientific and perfidious," while the telegram from the city fathers of Glendale read: "Evolution undermines the moral and religious foundations of our state and accomplishes no good whatsoever. It has been repudiated by the best scientists in the world to-day [!]."

The Rev. Alonzo Baker, one of the editors of *Signs of the Times*, representing the Seventh Day Adventists at the hearing, announced that if the Tennessee law is held constitutional, the Fundamentalists would work for an anti-evolution law in California, either by initiative petition or through the 1927 legislature. We shall see that they decided on the latter method.

The scientific side of the question was represented at the hearing by Dr. Charles A. Kofoid, of the University of California, the celebrated zoologist, and by the president of the Science League of America; and the Modernist viewpoint was espoused by Dr. Louis I. Newman, Rabbi of Temple Emanu-El, San Francisco, the author of "Jewish Influences on Christian Reform Movements."

"If scientists do not object to evolution," said Dr. Newman, "why should the religionists object? The problem lies within the field of science, not of religion. I am a theologian. I believe in God just as firmly as any man within the sound of my voice, but I am not going to ignore the plain lessons that nature spreads before me.

"Science, knowledge and investigation should be free. You must not make hypocrites of our authors and teachers. You must not strait-jacket the human mind."

Letters in support of the teaching of evolution were received from several teachers. "We who teach science,"

said a typical letter from a physics instructor, "follow the opinion of scientists. . . . All who teach must take the word of experts."

The Honor Society of the Riverside Junior College submitted a "statement on evolution," dated June 2, 1925, and reading:

"Science has transformed our understanding and control of the material world. Consider what American life would be without the knowledge of electricity which we have gained and applied since the time of Benjamin Franklin. Or consider the modern knowledge of disease which has conquered typhoid, for example, by discovering the microbe which causes the disease, and devising ways to protect our bodies from this microbe.

"Therefore at least an elementary knowledge of science is an essential part of any education that adequately fits the student for the modern world.

"Science is no exception to the rule that human knowledge is always partial and imperfect. The spirit of the scientific investigator, however, is one of open-minded and persistent search for truth. The teacher of science should therefore be unhampered in his presentation of the results and methods of the scientific investigator, for two reasons. First, only thus can he present the truth of his field of science most clearly and adequately. Second, only thus can he develop most fully in his students the freedom from prejudice and the open-minded devotion to truth which are greatly needed for the success of popular government and the preservation of the peace of the world.

"In this country there is a widespread and organized effort to suppress by legislation the teaching of the theory of evolution in our public schools. Truth cannot be established or suppressed by an act of legislature. The facts of nature exist and can be observed. The observation of these facts enables us to formulate ideas or theories. Such theories must then be tested to determine whether or not they agree with all the

facts. By this process of testing all things and retaining those which are found true, science has advanced civilization and will continue to advance it. Scientific investigators who have studied existing plants and animals, including man, as well as the fossils in the rocks, are generally agreed that the facts which they have observed strongly support the theory of evolution. Any adequate teaching of science must give the student an idea of what this theory is. We, therefore, earnestly protest against the proposed legislative restriction on teaching."

At a meeting of the Southern California Sigma Xi Association (made up of honor students of science), held at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, on June 2, 1925, the following resolution was adopted (reported in *Science*, official organ of the American Association for the Advancement of Science):

"Resolved, That the Southern California Association of Sigma Xi view with amazement and concern the propaganda that is going on in certain parts of the country, having as its object the restriction of the freedom of teaching in science. We would remind the thinking public

"(1) That our civil, religious, intellectual and economic progress have resulted very largely from this freedom within the schools, colleges and universities of the land. To attempt to take away this constitutional right is to return to the methods of the Middle Ages.

"(2) We call attention to certain characteristics of the method of science:

"(a) The sincere search for truth without reference to the effect of such truth upon previous opinion or belief.

"(b) That any statement of the findings of science is in the nature of the case a statement of the balance of evidence and not a dogmatic assertion of finality. Even the 'law' of gravity is subject to revision or restatement.

"(c) That there is and can be no conflict between religion and science: to assert the contrary is to misunderstand the scope of both."

All of the books objected to were finally passed upon favorably by the board, and the Fundamentalists returned to their homes declaring that the fight had just begun.

A few months later an interesting incident occurred in Los Angeles. Dr. Kofoid had been asked to address the Ministerial Association of Los Angeles on the subject of evolution. Illustrating his speech by drawings and photographs, he had just pointed out the marked skeletal similarity between the anthropoid apes and man, when the entire clerical audience burst into the noisy singing of a hymn. This continued until Dr. Kofoid was completely drowned out and obliged to leave the platform to which he had been invited.

As an example of the growing strength of the anti-evolutionary movement in California, the following episode may also be somewhat thought-provoking, especially in view of the fact that the school concerned stands almost within the shadow of one of the largest and most advanced universities in the world—the University of California.

On the completion of the new million-dollar high school in Alameda (near Oakland, and practically a suburb of San Francisco), teachers in the various departments were requested to send in two representative names to be chiselled on panels on the walls of the building. The science department chose Newton and Darwin. Thereupon the School Board protested, refusing to ac-

cept the name of Darwin, and demanded an alternate selection. The science teachers then voted for Agassiz—the most eminent of nineteenth century teachers of zoology in America. This choice was entirely satisfactory to the board, since this great naturalist is frequently quoted by Fundamentalists as having been an opponent of evolution. They forget to mention, however, that all the most celebrated of his pupils (such as Dr. Jordan) became evolutionists, and that Agassiz himself, shortly before his death, admitted that the theory of evolution would have to be accepted as firmly and permanently established.

The significance of this action on the part of the School Board arises from the fact (admitted by one of the members) that it was caused by the feeling that Darwin's conclusions were "opposed to certain fundamental [ist] religious principles." On this ground the Alumni Association of the school attacked the board's decision, and was joined in its protest by the Science League of America. The League drafted a protest, which was given full publicity in the daily press. The result was in the nature of a drawn battle. The board decided to place no names at all on the panels, and directed that the names of Virgil and Franklin, already inscribed, be removed from the wall. Such an occurrence would have been unthinkable only four years ago.

The resolution adopted by the directors of the high school Alumni Association, November 6, 1925, ran as follows:

"Be it resolved by the Board of Directors of the Alameda High School Alumni Association, that we go on record as

protesting the removal of the name of Charles Darwin from the list of names that are to be [placed on] panels on the science wing of the new high school.

"And be it further resolved that we recommend to the Board of Education that they reconsider their action in dropping the name of Charles Darwin."

The war on modern science is still in full progress in the Golden State. Each and every convention of the Fundamentalist sects "goes on record" as being opposed to the teaching of evolution. At the annual convention of the Eastern Baptist Association of California and Oregon, meeting in Roseville, California, June 22, 1926, "the theory that man sprang from an ape-like mammal" was strongly denounced. The members of this organization stated they would take an active part in securing the legislative suppression of the teaching of evolution in California and Oregon.

It seems that even Oakland—some years ago modestly described by a local educator as "the Athens of America"—has fallen under the blighting influence of Fundamentalist interference with school affairs. James S. Dickson, of Oakland, in a letter to *The San Francisco Chronicle* (dated July 27, 1926) expresses his astonishment that:

"The high school syllabus is being 'cooked' so that while organic evolution will be taught in advanced biology courses, no mention of it will be made in so far as it pertains to man. [The Roman Catholic procedure.] All of which shows that psychologically most of us are living in the sixteenth century. What is the explanation of this? In an age when man is so fearless in tackling the forces of nature, why is he such an intellectual coward as to be afraid to look facts in the face?"

Probably "most of us" are not living psychologically in the sixteenth century; but "most of us" are apathetic, egoistic individualists, while the Fundamentalists, though a minority, are organized and ever eager to fight in defense of their infantile views—working day and night, as a *unit*, to accomplish their purposes. Even so, their achievement in so advanced a community as Oakland is somewhat startling.

Following the example of the Fundamentalist sects, the Christian Scientists now demand that no school textbooks shall contain any scientific statements that conflict with the published views of the late Mrs. Eddy. Quite recently, members of the Christian Science Publication Committee sent a letter of protest to the State Board of Education at Sacramento, with reference to Prof. John W. Ritchie's widely used "Primer of Physiology." In this work Professor Ritchie, a fellow of the University of Chicago, who gave four years to graduate work in that great institution, gives the school pupils the following good advice concerning the proper care of their health:

> "We must realize that sickness is a real thing and that when it comes upon us we cannot depend upon the mind alone to restore us to health. When a child has diphtheria, only antitoxin will save its heart from being poisoned, and when tuberculosis attacks the lungs, good food, fresh air, and rest, as well as cheerfulness and hope, are needed if the body is to make a winning fight against the germs. . . . The mind cannot take poisons out of the body; it cannot kill germs that get into the body. These things the body must do for itself, and all that the mind can do is to help to keep each organ of the body at work at its particular task."

Such is the teaching of natural science. But the teach-

ing of un-natural "Science" is quite to the contrary; and the followers of Mrs. Eddy's new "Scriptures" demand that boards of education eliminate from state text-books any findings of modern science which conflict with "Science and Health."

As in the case of the Fundamentalists, the California State Board of Education, instead of performing its duty according to the State Constitution, which divorces Church and State absolutely, conceded the right of the deceased Mrs. Eddy, through her followers, to dictate what shall or shall not be taught in our public schools! While regretting that "under the law the book could not be stricken from the list of authorized text-books," the Christian anti-Scientists were assured that the objectionable passages would be eliminated in future editions of the Physiology. In other words, demonstrated, incontrovertible facts of science, of vital importance to the youth of the State, are to be sacrificed—and the children with them!—to satisfy the sectarian demands of a rich and powerful body of religionists of a peculiar type.

A recent report from Sacramento reads (October 13, 1926):

> "Forecasting reopening at a future date of the bitter battle between Fundamentalists and Modernists over the teaching of the Darwinian [evolutionary] theory, in California public schools, the State Board of Education is prepared to seek legislative aid in breaking present text-book laws. . . . After a protracted discussion, the educational body voted unanimously to seek abolition of the present law requiring adoption of school texts for an eight year period. The new act, if passed, will empower the board to enter into contracts for four year terms, or even a shorter period."

If the short-period law is passed, it means that all text-books containing information on the subject of evolution can be thrown out, by majority vote of the State Board of Education, on short notice, at the behest of the organized forces of reaction, claiming as they do to "represent a large majority of the taxpayers of California." The medical profession of California is beginning to realize that the war on modern science in the Golden State calls for more than a passing word of disapproval. The following abstracts from Webster K. Nolan's report of the proceedings of the fifty-fifth annual convention of the California Medical Association (April, 1926) are worth careful consideration:

"Severely arraigning the state lawmakers of America for attempting to control human conduct, the laws of nature and the laws of economics, a task for which he declared many of them are utterly untrained from the viewpoint of science, Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, president of Stanford University, excoriated the efforts of legislators everywhere to stem the tide of progressive education.

"At the same time he issued a call to arms to doctors to take an active part in politics, 'however unsavory politics may be at times.'

"The stirring address of the distinguished savant was delivered before 2,000 physicians. . . . His talk was given under the auspices of the League for the Conservation of Public Health. . . .

"The president of the Association, Dr. Edward N. Ewer, remarked that 'if the compilers of the Bible found it necessary to include some folk-lore stories to press home moral guidance in an age of superstition, fear and ignorance, it was good psychology. There is abundant evidence we have not yet approached the passing of the age of superstition. Four states of the Union, for instance, have been made unsafe for science by laws hampering its teaching. . . . But evolution stands

even though it cannot produce a set of working models, ranging from a single cell moving in the ooze of the palaeozoic seas, on through successive living things to *homo sapiens.*'"

The first gun of the 1927 anti-evolution campaign in California was fired on December 10, 1926, in San Jose, when our old acquaintance, Dr. Arthur I. Brown, the Vancouver Bible Crusader who caused so much trouble in the Tilghman High School at Paducah, Kentucky, commenced a series of speeches on "Men, Monkeys and Missing Links," "Some Absurdities of Evolution," "Jonah and the Whale, and Noah's Ark and the Flood," and similar subjects. The chairman was the Rev. Paul Rood, of Turlock, president and founder of the Bryan Bible League, who "made a stirring appeal for membership in the League." The meetings were held under the auspices of the First Baptist Church of San Jose. (I am indebted for this information to Cora P. Wilson, of that city, a life-long worker for freedom of thought.)

On January 17, 1927, immediately after the Tennessee Supreme Court Decision, Assemblyman S. L. Heisinger, of Selma, a farmer, introduced the threatened anti-evolution bill into the California State Assembly. As originally written, the bill, which prescribed no penalty, added a new section to the Political Code, to read as follows:

> "The theory of evolution shall not be taught as a fact in any public, elementary or secondary school of this state."

This, of course, is merely the ruling of the State Board of Education enacted as statute. The bill was referred to

the committee on education, where it was killed after a public hearing on March 15th.

Immediately all scientific and liberal forces in the state arose in protest against this Tennesseeizing of California. Among those speaking strongly against the bill were Pres. W. W. Campbell of the University of California, State Superintendent Will C. Wood (now head of the state banks) and his assistant, Sam M. Cohn, Rabbi Louis I. Newman, Dr. W. E. Allen of the Scripps Institute of Oceanography at La Jolla, Dr. Omar Goslin of the University Baptist Church of Berkeley, and Rev. Berkeley B. Blake, Sacramento Unitarian minister. The annual convention of the Episcopal diocese, being held at this time in San Francisco, passed a resolution against legislation "limiting freedom of thought, study, or pursuit of knowledge," and sent a copy to every state legislator. Most of the newspapers came out in condemnation of the bill, *The Argonaut,* of San Francisco, leading the fight.

Protest briefs were sent to the committee on education by a number of organized bodies, including the American Association for Medical Progress, the Honor Society of Riverside, the Civil Liberties Union, and others. The Science League of America naturally expended every effort to prevent passage of such a bill in the state in which its national headquarters are situated, not only sending a brief and requesting all its California members to protest against the bill, but also preparing for representation, through its president, at the hearing when it is held in Sacramento.

On February 23rd, when the legislature reconvened after a recess, Heisinger introduced an amendment to

his bill, making it much more inclusive. Stating that the prohibition of the teaching of evolution as a "fact" might be confusing, he now caused his bill to forbid the teaching (though again "as a fact") that "man descended or ascended from a lower order of animals," and extended it to cover colleges and universities as well as elementary and secondary schools. Passage of the bill in 1927 was extremely improbable; but if it had been passed, it would have ruined the immensely important scientific work of the University of California and its allied institutions, such as the Scripps Institute of Oceanography and the School of Tropical Agriculture at Riverside.

"Inasmuch as the teaching of religion is banned in the state schools," stated Heisinger, "I believe that evolution, which is obviously an anti-religious theory, should also be banned."

Many California pro-evolutionists, who are loath to "do anything about it," preferring to fall back upon a futile cynicism, contend that even if an anti-evolution law were enacted in the state, the Supreme Court would declare such a bill unconstitutional. As a matter of fact, there are no certain legal grounds for such complacency. A writer in *The San Francisco Daily News* has covered this point quite clearly in saying:

> "John Scopes would have been convicted in California as readily as in Tennessee, if the California Legislature had enacted a law similar to the Tennessee law prohibiting the teaching of evolution in the public schools. California experts in constitutional law arrived at this conclusion after a research into the laws of this state dealing with education. . . .
>
> "The Bible is not a sectarian book, according to a recent

ruling. California courts in the case of Evans versus the Selma Union High School held there is nothing in the statutes aimed at religious books. The Bible is a religious book, but it is not a sectarian one, therefore the Legislature could even prescribe it as a text to be used in the public schools.

"By the same ruling, the Legislature could forbid the teaching of any doctrine that would be inimical to the Bible or that would dispute its authority. The Legislature has not, of course, made such a ruling, but in some of the school districts in southern California the Bible has been prescribed as a reading book in the schools. . . .

"Schooling is a right that is not regulated by the Federal Constitution. It is a matter that rests entirely with the states. The public school system could be abolished at any time by a vote of the people and such abolition could not violate any federal law.

"This being the case, the Legislature is at full liberty to prescribe what shall or shall not be taught. It could forbid the teaching of any of the sciences or arts and could confine schooling to the most elementary subjects.

"Consequently, say local experts, there can be no question but that should the Legislature of the State of California pass a law forbidding the teaching of evolution in the schools of this state, such a law would be entirely legal under the California constitution."

While the vast majority of the good citizens of California go about their business unconcerned and unmindful of the problem of freedom, the enemies of progress carry on a day-by-day program of intolerance and hatred of all who will not accept their opinions as final. *The Pasadena Broadcaster*, for example, writes editorially:

"When a teacher in the public schools or colleges talks evolution, take him out and put him with this class that he claims to be the offspring of. Southern California has a number of

fine zoos and we believe as Dr. Riley, that *it would be better to have them take away the eyes from the physical body of the children* of to-day than to blind their spiritual eyes with such rot as is being taught over this land of ours."

A typical Fundamentalist (of San Francisco) writes to a daily paper: "All two-legged monkeys deserve to be exterminated from the face of the earth as common pests."

And *The King's Business*, a monthly published by the Bible Institute, in Los Angeles, says under date of February, 1925:

"A terrible blow has been given the church by the act of one preacher [Hight] who combined his preaching of the Word of God with a lustful love and monstrous murder,—poisoning his own wife and the husband of the object of his illicit affection. . . .

"But we want to use this crime as an illustration, and—while our minds are centered upon this awful event—call your attention to a crime far beyond it in magnitude, because so far-reaching; a crime which is being committed daily against the true church; against the children and youth; against the home; against the very foundations upon which, by the grace of God, we have been built as a nation.

"What is it? It is the crime of the preachers and professors who—as did this preacher—take advantage of their position to insidiously inject the poisons of unbelief in the Word of God by denying its authenticity and authority. They are the real enemies of God and man who, while feeding from the hand of deceived people who pay their bills, knowingly further the interests of Satan, hating the Word and work of God, hesitating at no step that will promote the interests of their destructive designs."

The fact that the murderous and lascivious minister in question was a Fundamentalist is hidden by the false

statement that he entertained "unbelief in the Word of God"—a characteristic method of Fundamentalism.

The editorial goes on to say that the clerical murderer in question will be hanged (though he was not), and demands that "equal justice be meted out" to the evolutionists and Modernists, "the criminals in school and church," who are declared worthy of the punishment spoken of in Hebrews x, 28–30—which is a "sorer punishment" than to "die without mercy under two or three witnesses."

And this is the voice of no negligible and isolated group of fanatics, but of a prosperous and powerful body in the great city of Los Angeles. Truly does Dr. Henry Frank aver ("The Doom of Dogma and the Triumph of Truth," page 278):

"The age demands freedom for the teacher, freedom for the worshipper, freedom for the thinker, freedom for honesty, sincerity and truth. Without this privilege neither science nor religion can conquer. Henceforth, if we are asked for our creed and faith, we would point not to scrolls and tomes, musty with the dust of superstition; not to priests and palimpsests; not to synods and decrees; not to rites and vestments; but to an honest heart inscribed with the motto of all zealous lives: 'Here is sincere search after truth.' "

CHAPTER VIII

THESE BENIGHTED STATES

IT is commonly assumed that the anti-evolution agitation of the Fundamentalists is limited to the southern states. This is very far from the case, as we have already seen in Chapter VII. In this chapter I have collected data on the subject referring exclusively to states outside the south—and not only to the more or less isolated communities, but to most of our most populous and highly civilized commonwealths. It must be remembered also that many states not mentioned here (for example, Pennsylvania) are omitted not because there is no anti-evolution propaganda in them, but because specific instances of overt interference with the schools of these commonwealths has not been published, or otherwise made known to me. It is probably safe to say that there is not one state in the Union in which anti-evolution and anti-Modernist propaganda is not being carried on by the ever-busy Fundamentalists.

NEW YORK

There are many persons still living who can recall the bitter struggle that occurred in New York when Ezra Cornell, with Dr. Andrew D. White, founded Cornell

University (Ithaca). It had been announced that the new college was to be devoted particularly to the dissemination of pure and applied science, and was to be wholly free from ecclesiastical control. The Fundamentalists of the day at once began an attack upon both Cornell and Dr. White, and a determined political and legal effort was made to prevent the proposed secular college from obtaining a charter. One result of this intolerance on the part of the reactionary element among the ministers of the Empire State was the preparation and delivery of a series of lectures in New York on "The Warfare of Science and Theology"—later forming part of Dr. White's classical book on this subject.

To-day we are witnessing the beginning of another battle in this state, the war of the Fundamentalists on evolution and Modernism—at bottom, a war on modern science and the method of science.

Attacks on freedom of teaching are being made even in the great city of New York. The question, "Must evolution be removed from text-books?" was the subject of discussion at a luncheon in the Town Hall of the metropolis in April, 1926. As was remarked at the time, "A few years back such a meeting would have been impossible." It was reported that while nearly all those present favored the teaching of evolution in the public schools, "with a few honorable exceptions, the speakers resorted to all sorts of compromises and evasions in the statement of their position."

Dr. Paul B. Mann, head of the department of biology in Evander Childs High School, expressed his approval of the inclusion of evolution in the text-books, but advocated that instruction in the theory be given only by

believers in "some religion." Shintoism or Buddhism, for example? Or does the learned scientist really mean Fundamentalism?

As long ago as 1922, Dr. John Roach Straton, leader of the New York Fundamentalists, began a campaign to have text-books dealing with the theory of evolution excluded from New York City's public schools. His efforts were roundly condemned, not only by the press of the state, but by leading journals throughout the nation.

"No one," said the editor of *The San Francisco Call*, "will take very seriously the doctor's present attempt to bar every text-book from the New York City schools that even suggests the existence of the Darwinian theory of evolution. Dr. Straton thinks that theory is unreliable. But he isn't content to argue about it. He wants it squashed out of existence, which isn't at all courageous or sportsmanlike.

"But if all other people were like the intolerant Mr. Voliva and the jaundice-eyed Dr. Straton neither of these two gentlemen would be allowed to talk any longer. The public is amused by Dr. Crafts, the blue law king, and Billy Sunday, who still talks now and then—and ordinary people are tolerant of their intolerance. But all of these four gentlemen, if they only knew it, are spending their lives chopping away at the very foundations of their own liberty to exist and have their say in the world."

Protestant (Fundamentalist) Dr. W. B. Riley, of Minneapolis, agrees with Catholic (Fundamentalist) Dr. James G. Walsh, professor of psychology in Cathedral College, New York, in declaring that there are no fossils and no archaeological records to show that man has developed from lower to higher forms physically or mentally. Says Dr. Riley:

"Who will answer Dr. Walsh, . . . who says, 'Man has not progressed. The unhappiest age of the world is right now. There has not been a new thing in architecture in 400 years; the greatest novel ever written is over 300 years old, Cervantes' "Don Quixote"; the greatest play ever written was Æschylus' "Prometheus." Homer, the wandering Greek poet, wrote the greatest epic poem centuries before Christ' " (in about the same way as David wrote the Psalms, or Solomon the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament, or Moses the Pentateuch!).

Who, indeed, will answer Dr. Walsh! Men who can see no improvement in the electric drill of modern man over the flint-flakes of the primitive settlers in the Valley of the Nile or in the deposits of the Marne, the Somme, the Thames and the Ouse, could not be answered in any language a Fundamentalist could understand.

Following Dr. Straton's and Dr. Walsh's lead, other blind leaders of the blind soon gave vent to their long pent-up resentment of the advance of science over tradition. A United Press dispatch of July 24, 1922, said:

"Ape-ism split the ranks of New York ministers to-day. The opening gun in what promises to be the bitterest theological feud of a decade was fired from half a dozen opposing pulpits.

"Demand that the name of the cathedral of St. John the Divine be changed to 'a church for the descendants of the apes' was made in a bitter attack upon the Very Rev. Howard Chandler Robbins, dean of St. John the Divine, by Dr. George McPherson, a noted Baptist evangelist. Along with Dean Robbins, Harry Emerson Fosdick . . . came in for a share of Dr. McPherson's attention. McPherson demanded that both resign their positions.

" 'The trail of these men,' declared McPherson, 'leads not to Bethlehem's manger, but to the wilderness. If these botanical

[*sic*] baboon boosters to whom Dean Robbins and Dr. Fosdick belong are consistent they will see that they form new churches with the sign over the door; "Only those permitted to worship here who believe themselves to be of beastly origin."'"

Writing in *Harper's Magazine* (March, 1926), on "The Dangers of Modernism," Dr. Fosdick said:

"The liberal movement in religion is a protest against the Fundamentalist assault upon intelligence. That assault is real and dangerous. If it should succeed it would bring on a twentieth-century replica of the dark ages in religion. . . .

"That this alliance [between religion and intelligence] must be fought for if we are not to lose it seems clear, and the Fundamentalists have no one but themselves to blame for the insistence with which Modernists force the issue. A few weeks ago in New York a prominent Fundamentalist brought a mass meeting of his fellows to tumultuous cheers by the climactic assertion, 'I would rather have my son learn his A B C's in heaven than know his Greek in hell.' Well, who wouldn't? But why the dilemma? . . . Why this tireless insinuation that an intelligent man who knows the ages of the rock cannot know the Rock of Ages too? The nemesis of this sort of thing is already upon us in many of our youth who believe what they are being told and, not willing to forswear intelligence, are surrendering Christianity."

Very interesting in this connection was a vote taken at St. Stephen's College (Episcopal), at Annandale-on-Hudson, New York (February 15, 1922). Of the seventy men students who voted on the question of whether one could be at once a consistent adherent to the Christian religion and a proponent of evolution, sixty-six voted "yes." Of the four other students, one said "perhaps";

one was doubtful; while the other two were quite positive that the two principles "could not mix."

In May, 1926, New York City's Superintendent of Schools, Dr. W. J. O'Shea, and Eugene Gibney, Director of Extension Activities, denied the Union of East and West and the League of Neighbors the use of the Morris High School for a Peace Week meeting, on the ground that one of the announced speakers was Arthur Garfield Hays, who "defended Scopes in the evolution case, and we cannot allow people to speak in the schools who are against religion." The Rev. Dr. John Haynes Holmes was also objected to on the general principle that he was "a dangerous divine." Another speaker objected to was the Rev. John Nevin Sayre, a pacifist, who believes with his Master that "they who take up the sword shall perish by the sword."

Commenting on this attitude of the Department of Education, *The Nation* says:

> "The free-school system must be kept free, not only from loose charges but from discrimination and intolerance. . . . The eternal fight for freedom goes on. This time the scene shifts from Dayton to Fifty-ninth Street and Park Avenue, New York City."

A note in *The Truth Seeker* (May 29, 1926) calls attention to the fact that Dr. O'Shea denies that he was accurately quoted with reference to the reason given for excluding Mr. Hays from the list of Peace Week speakers. He said that he had "no recollection" of mentioning the Scopes defense in this connection. On the other hand, Charles F. Weller, general executive of Peace Week, who reported the statements quoted (published in

The New York Times), insists that the conversations with O'Shea and Gibney are correct and based upon memoranda made at the time.

"Speakers not allowed to appear at the Extension meetings, judging from the action of the Board of Education," says *The Truth Seeker*, "are the peace advocates and the defenders of evolution. . . . As Mr. Hays said to a reporter, the school department is in the hands of 'prudes and pygmies, ignorant alike of the principles underlying the American government, and of the Constitution and history of the United States.' "

It is well known that there are many exceedingly backward "neighborhoods" in New York State. If things can go so far in the metropolis itself, an anti-evolution bill might, before long, have some chance for passage, though such an event seems at present quite incredible. Ignorant evangelists, local and "imported," find ears eager to applaud their childish prattle, even in New York City. For example, *The New York Times* published the following item in its issue of August 10, 1925:

"Addressing a thousand persons in the Tent Evangel, Ninety-fifth Street and West End Avenue, yesterday afternoon, the Rev. J. Frank Norris, Texas evangelist, said he planned to preach a sermon in the near future in which he would prove scientifically that Joshua actually stopped the sun in its course. He declared that he would employ the teachings of a professor at Columbia University to prove the Biblical account of that miracle literally true."

Why not put the question to a popular vote? The question of "the Biblical account" of an earth with "four corners" might also be settled by ballot, as is advocated by Norris in the case of evolution. The theory of evolu-

tion, in its modern form, is only sixty-eight years old, and if Dr. E. E. Slosson, director of Science Service, is correct, will not be generally accepted for another thirty-two years. Says this well-known scientist ("New Ideas for Old," *The Modern World*, December, 1926):

"A new idea comes first in the mind of one man. That means that the new idea starts out with a majority of 1,600,000,000 against it. If any of the innovations in scientific thought were put to a popular referendum they would be voted down by overwhelming majorities for the first hundred years or longer. If a plebiscite on the question of whether the earth is round and revolving or flat and stationary were put to a plebiscite of the entire world at the present time and compulsory voting were required, the Copernican theory of the universe would be repealed by an immense majority. Newton's law would never have been passed if it depended upon a popular vote."

More curious than alarming was the attempt of a group of Jewish Fundamentalists, of Brooklyn, to launch a periodical of their own (in 1925) under the name *Questions and Answers*. The "Answers" were to be knockout blows to all questions regarding evolution. A member of the Science League of America with a good sense of humor subscribed, and received two copies, followed a month or so later by the following self-explanatory letter:

"Ibsen said that the majority is always wrong.

"The majority of the 25,000 Jews who received *Questions and Answers* decided to think differently *than* you and we did. They did not send in subscription pledges, and as we cannot continue to pilot the periodical at our own expense, we are obliged to discontinue it. . . . We are confident that all of

you will gladly re-subscribe in the Fall if we mail you issue # 3 and notify you that a group has decided to finance this magazine."

The group apparently decided not to finance the magazine, since no "issue #3" has since appeared.

In Brooklyn also, the Rev. Dr. Charles F. McKay, pastor of the Greene Avenue Baptist Church, told his flock that evolution is "a lie of hell."

In *The Crusaders' Champion* of July 9, 1926, appeared the following item:

"'Here is at least one faculty that will not contain a single evolutionist or Modernist,' is a striking sentence in the announcement of the opening of the fall term, on September 20th, of the American Bible Training School, Brooklyn, New York. Dr. L. W. Barnard is its president."

New York doubtless does not, as yet, envy Brooklyn its "one faculty"! Were this faculty not of Fundamentalist faith, one visit to the Museum of Natural History in the sister city would cure them of their "traditionalitis." But for the Fundamentalist the great museum exists in vain. *The Baptist Trumpet*, Columbus, Ohio, observes:

"After looking through Henry Fairfield Osborn's 'Hall of Man,' we suppose the scientist in 2026 will be 'reconstructing' a railway locomotive from the wing of an airplane, the wheel of a baby coach, the cylinder of a mogul engine and the rattle of a flivver."

For some years now Dr. Straton has been carrying on a more than ridiculous campaign against the American Museum of Natural History. He demands that a representation of Moses be substituted for fossil relics of

man in the museum. At present "The Hall of the Age of Man" is the object of the learned divine's most virulent attacks, based, of course, not upon any scientific or historical grounds,—for Straton knows nothing of the modern science of anthropology—but upon his clear recognition of the fact that if the exhibits in the Hall are *bona fide*, then the story of the creation of man in Genesis is purely mythical. Hence he asks:

"Is the American Museum of Natural History misspending the taxpayers' money, and poisoning the minds of school children by false and bestial theories of evolution? Ought not the Bible to be exhibited at the museum as well as a lot of musty old bones? Isn't Genesis right?"

The answer of science is: No, between scientists and traditionalists there can be no genuine compromise. To which Dr. Straton's "come-back" is: "Better wipe out all the schools than undermine belief in the Bible by permitting the teaching of evolution."

"I sometimes wonder," remarks Edwin Tenney Brewster ("Fundamentalist Frauds," *The Truth Seeker*, February 20, 1926), "if any layman ever really understands the workings of the [Fundamentalist] mind. Here is Dr. Straton, in his—for the moment—latest tirade against science ('The Fancies of the Evolutionists,' *The Forum*, February, 1926, page 245 ff.) applying such terms as 'doctored to the last degree' (page 245), 'pictures of three of these imaginary men' (page 247), 'flimsy and tricky evidence' (page 248), to Professor McGregor's familiar busts of ancient man; although, to take a single case, the Crô-Magnon restoration is based on more than forty skeletons, with portions of a hundred others, checked up for details by the mural paintings, engravings on bone, and figurines in stone and ivory in which Crô-Magnon man has represented himself or his womankind.

"It is well to be critical, always. But this same Dr. Straton who raises such a row because the 'Old Man of Crô-Magnon' appears in public with some false teeth, only two pages farther along in the same article (page 250) demands that the Director of the American Museum of Natural History shall 'roll all the showcases containing these gruesome [and no longer "imaginary"] bones to one side of the Hall,' and display in their stead 'a picture of Moses.' One wonders on just what data this stickler for accuracy in other people proposes to base his own 'reconstructions'!

"Incidentally, there chances to be one little fact that I'm sure Dr. Straton will prefer to keep suppressed—that's why I mention it. This particular 'evolutionist' 'fancy' actually starts with Buckland's 'Red Lady of Wales' in 1823, the earliest of the Crô-Magnon finds. Now, Buckland was both a clergyman and a Fundamentalist!"

Dr. D. H. Galloway, of New Mexico, acting on Dr. Straton's interesting idea, wrote to Prof. Henry Fairfield Osborn, Director of the Museum of Natural History, recommending that he take Straton's advice and include a Bibical exhibit among his other collections. In a row of cases, Dr. Galloway suggested that Dr. Osborn put, first, the Bible, open at the text, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." This was to be accompanied by a picture of a witch-hanging at the time when colonial New England law was founded on the Bible. (It was John Wesley who declared that "if you give up your belief in witches you might as well give up your belief in the Bible.")

Among Dr. Galloway's other suggestions were representations of "the wars and massacres carried on by divine command," "the love ventures of Adam and Eve, or Abraham and Sarah, of Lot and his daughters, of the hero and heroine of Solomon's Song," "David 'dancing

before the Lord,' " "illustrations of polygamous Bible worthies with their trains of wives." "Globes that falsely represent the shape of our planet should be abolished, and a flat earth shown with an angel at each of its four corners."

In his interesting list of "Fundamentalist Frauds," Mr. Brewster calls particular attention to this one, from the "Special Evolution Number" of *The Herald of Christ's Kingdom* (Brooklyn, September 15, 1925):

"Here is a paragraph (page 275) purporting to be the quoted words of Charles Darwin, in which is set forth an opinion precisely opposite to that which Darwin has expressed in all other passages bearing on the same topic. One need not add that the alleged quotation serves as the text for an Awful Warning.

"Examination of Darwin's 'Life and Letters'—one has to hunt through the two big volumes; for of course there is no citation—reveals that this 'quotation' has been ingeniously patched up out of part of one paragraph from page 277 of volume one, combined with part of another from page 282. In addition, to make assurance doubly sure for the basis of the Moral Lecture, Darwin's 'I deserve to be called a Theist' has been altered into 'I deserve to be called an Atheist.'

"Was it done on purpose? Well, one might, by way of the ear, mistake 'a theist' for 'atheist'; but hardly 'a Theist' by way of the eye; and one doesn't often drop out four and a half pages of text by a 'typographical error.' Besides, people who write long essays for Special Evolution Numbers on 'The Bible and Evolution' are supposed to know something about the subject—and Darwin's religious opinions are common knowledge.

"Moreover, there are some dozen or twenty similar and obvious 'mistakes' in this 'Special Evolution Number,' all of which got by the 'Editorial Committee, at least three of whom have read and approved for publication each and every arti-

cle appearing in these columns.' Any of us may make *one* mistake. But when they come two-three to the page, all uniformly in the author's favor, and all passed by his three examiners—*sancta simplicitas!*"

It was none other than the "true believer" Dr. John Roach Straton of New York who deliberately led astray a fellow-traditionalist in far-off California—and thence thousands of voters in the Golden State. According to Mr. Brewster, it occurred this way:

"To persuade the Californians to their ends, the California Fundamentalists are using Dr. Straton's poisoned ammunition. Thus one reads (*Baptist Fundamentalist and Bible Student*, Sacramento, California, December, 1925, page 3): 'Huxley said: "Evolution if consistently accepted makes it impossible to believe in the Bible"'—no reference, of course. . . .

"Only it so happens that Huxley did *not* say 'evolution if consistently accepted makes it impossible to believe in the Bible.' The man who did say it was the Rev. John Roach Straton, D.D., who faked the quotation for use in his New York debate. [The famous debate on evolution held with the Rev. Dr. Charles Francis Potter, then of New York, now of Antioch College.] . . .

"This particular bit of priestcraft is part of a longer 'extract,' part of which may possibly be genuine ('Evolution vs. Creation,' 1924, page 23). Dr. Straton's practice throughout the debate seems to be to give citations for his genuine quotations, and to omit them for the spurious ones. This has no citation."

It is by such unscrupulous methods that the Fundamentalists throughout the Union, in speech and print, carry on their attacks on modern science, misleading voters and lawmakers, and intimidating teachers into

silent submission—a silence which is construed by many laymen as acknowledgment of defeat.

"There will be nobody left in the teaching profession but cowards and liars," said Dr. William Hepperell Montague, professor of philosophy at Columbia University, "if the movement against the freedom of thought and expression continues. . . . Such a law [as an anti-evolution statute] places teachers in a doubtful position. They are faced with the alternative either of foreswearing what their intelligence tells them is the truth and teaching what they know is not true, or leaving the teaching profession. This latter course would involve severe hardships, many of them having families and other dependents upon them. The outcome of this situation can only be the impoverishment of the schools by the loss of the ablest teachers. Those who are now endeavoring to dictate what should and what should not be taught in the schools are traitors to the finest spirit of American life. They are the real menace to the integrity and permanence of our institutions."

The teacher of science cannot fulfill his true mission in our schools if he is to be hampered in his work by the careful avoidence of a legally or morally tabooed subject. Part of the value of a teacher to his class is his example of sincerity and honesty. The Rev. Dr. Alfred Wesley Wishart, a liberal Baptist clergyman of Grand Rapids, Michigan, has brought out this phase of the subject very plainly in his thought-provoking pamphlet, "Evolution and Religion" (page 12):

"Among the true saints we may class many men of science. Generally, they are men of clean lives, fundamentally honest, public spirited, and self-sacrificing. Real scientists are men who do not fool themselves, who do not pretend, make

believe, conceal their real convictions or compromise with error. *They are willing to stand up and be counted.* This is the very essence of the scientific spirit. Do not fear that the boy in school, coming in contact with such men, will lose his faith and character, will become reckless and immoral because of science. Do not have any such fear, for as a class scientific men impress the youth of the land with the necessity of being honest and upright, and teach them to think clearly, to face facts, and to obey law. That is the very essence of the scientific spirit in the modern world."

NEW JERSEY

A New Jersey minister, the Rev. Charles Hillman Fountain, of Plainfield, is quoted as saying:

"We are not going to stop until we have driven every Modernist out of our pulpits and seminaries and editorial chairs. We are going to put them out *if it takes our lives to do it.*"

As a consequence of such incendiary propaganda, a mob at Morristown, the seat of Morris county, during the winter of 1924–25 made a bonfire of scientific books. Not one of the many newspapers in the county commented adversely on the affair.

New Jersey, however, as the home of more than one great university, has still some defenders of civilization. In his baccalaureate address on June 18, 1923, for example, Dr. John Grier Hibben, president of Princeton, defended evolution, upheld the teachings of Dr. Fosdick, and denounced the Fundamentalists.

DELAWARE

On February 8, 1927, an anti-evolution bill bearing the familiar prohibition of "the teaching that man

either descended or ascended from a lower order of animals" was introduced into the Delaware Legislature by Representative Hastings of Sussex county, at the request of the Rev. George A. Cooke, a Methodist minister of Frankford. The bill made violation a misdemeanor, and prohibited the use of text-books devoted in whole or part to the theory of evolution. It was referred to the Committee on Fish, Game and Oysters(!), where it was allowed to perish.

MASSACHUSETTS

It will be remembered that the summer home of the Bible Crusaders and their magazine is at Manomet, Plymouth, Massachusetts, where the Pilgrim Fathers—our first Fundamentalists!—landed in 1620. This state has also the distinction of a recent blasphemy trial to record among its anachronisms.

Cardinal William H. O'Connell of Boston has joined Dr. Straton's hue and cry against the American Museum of Natural History and its Hall of Man: "No one should leave a dollar to this false museum until Dr. Osborn becomes a real scientist!"

But in spite of these untoward events the civilized standard of the Bay State still holds. At its meeting in Boston on May 25, 1926, the Unitarian Laymen's League took a definite stand for the advancement of the teaching of evolution, after hearing a talk by Dr. Edwin E. Slosson, in which he outlined the efforts of the Fundamentalists to exclude biology from the schools, and their successful attempts to cause publishers of text-books to eliminate the theory of evolution and the facts

of geology and comparative anatomy from the volumes they issue.

A striking manifestation of the reactionary trend of contemporary thought was the outburst of anti-evolution speeches made at the International Congress of Philosophy, meeting at Harvard University (September, 1926). Several of the metaphysicians present rejected the theory of evolution as untenable, according to press reports. It seems, however, that the chief objections were directed against strictly monistic or mechanistic evolution. Dr. Hans Adolf Edouard Driesch accepted evolution as a fact, but, as is well known, he demands recognition of an *entelechy*, or vitalistic directing force behind physical phenomena. Dr. H. Wildon Carr, of Kings College, London, attempted to draw a sharp distinction—an unbridgeable chasm, so far as resident physical forces are concerned—between the living and the "non-living" worlds. Reporting the position of Driesch and others of his school, *The New York Times* stated:

> "Non-living matter they were willing to treat as uniformly subject to laws, many of which are known to the scientist, but at the point that animate life began some new element, a creative force perhaps, entered into the equation, and made the direction and behavior of life forms unpredictable."

Very likely the only reason for our inability to predict the behavior of life forms in many cases—in many other cases their behavior is quite readily predictable—is our present inadequate knowledge of the multitudinous factors involved. But here we are mainly concerned with calling attention to the widespread interest to-day in the question of evolution, and to what appears to be

a decided tendency on the part of many persons to avoid the materialistic implications of the theory of transformism when carried to logical conclusions, based solely upon observed facts.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

On February 9, 1927, an anti-evolution bill introduced into the New Hampshire legislature by Rep. Roscoe Crane of Washington was killed by the committee on education. The bill provided that it was unlawful for any teacher in the public schools "to teach philosophy which deals with religious belief, especially such as the evolutionary theory of the origin of the world." The penalty was forfeiture of one month's salary for the first offense, and cancellation of the teaching license for the second.

The committee voted that it was "inexpedient to legislate on this question," and thus quashed the bill.

MAINE

Despite the fact that Gov. Ralph O. Brewster of Maine stated, in July, 1925, that he had no information as to any bills affecting the teaching of evolution in the public schools of that state, the Rev. B. C. Bubar, an evangelist who is now pastor of a Baptist church in Blaine, Maine, had already written a letter to Professor McIntyre, teacher of science in the Aroostook Central Institute, Mars Hill, Maine, and another to State Senator Hussey, protesting against the teaching of evolution in an institution supported by "Christian taxpayers." He said in part:

"If religion is not to be taught at the expense of the taxpayers, it certainly should not be torn down at their expense. It is just as much a violation of the constitution to tear religion down by teaching evolution as it is to build religion up by teaching the Bible.

"Many of the students attending the Aroostook Central Institute are from Christian homes. These parents vigorously object to their children being taught the theory of evolution. Yet this is being done and at the expense of these parents, who are taxpayers in the towns of Blaine and Mars Hill.

"It seems to me that the taxpayers have a right to decide what shall be taught in the public schools, since their checks pay the running expenses of the institutions. Therefore I, as a taxpayer and also as pastor of the First Baptist Church in the town of Blaine, most strenuously object to this text-book being used and to the instructors who are teaching evolution in our schools."

The people of Maine will undoubtedly have a real battle for freedom in teaching on their hands as soon as the brethren have removed hell from the high schools of the south and west. No state is to be slighted!

In fact, the first rumblings of that battle have already been heard. On February 17, 1927, an anti-evolution bill was introduced into the legislature by Representative Roy of Lewiston.

The bill prohibited the teaching of evolution in any university, college, normal, public school or other educational institution supported in whole or in part from the public funds. As usual, it forbade the teaching "that man has ascended or descended from a lower order of animals" (which seems to be becoming the standardized wording), and applied not only to teachers, but to school officials who selected text-books on the subject of evolution. Such officials were to be fined $500 maximum and

be removed from their positions; teachers were also to lose their positions and to be fined not more than $100. The act was to take effect September 1, 1927.

Representative Page, of Skowhegan, who had immediately tabled the bill when it was presented, later in the day called it out and yielded the floor to Representative Hale of Portland, who moved that it be indefinitely postponed. Representative Piper of Jackman called at once for an adjournment. By a vote of 49 to 43 the House adjourned, leaving the bill alive until the next day. Then, in spite of strenuous efforts by Bubar and his friends, it was killed.

The bill had been seeking a "father" for nearly a month, until Roy finally took it over. While it was under general discussion, Pres. Kenneth C. M. Sills of Bowdoin College said of it:

> "To one who knows Maine and its traditions it seems incredible that such a law should even be thought of, much less put before the legislature. . . . The very idea of legislating against science and against the pursuit of truth is preposterous and stupid, and contrary to the freedom and liberty of thought and speech in which we people of the state of Maine have taken such pride."

CONNECTICUT

Perhaps few persons remember that when the late Prof. William Graham Sumner—who once served as rector of the Church of the Redeemer at Morristown, New Jersey—introduced Herbert Spencer's "Study of Sociology" (1876) as a text-book at Yale, serious objections were raised by the college authorities. Spencer being a through-going "materialistic evolutionist," the

Yale theologians held that his book was dangerously irreligious, but "they could not deny that Sumner was as sincerely religious as they were." As Prof. Franklin H. Giddings put it, "In that affair he proved himself to be a wise no less than a courageous protagonist of academic freedom."

The present attitude of Yale is, of course, very different from this, with its great Peabody Museum of evolution. The Fundamentalist tide has not yet seriously menaced the shores of Connecticut, any more than it has those of Pennsylvania, Illinois, or a few other of the more urbanized states. But it may safely be assumed that the many Fundamentalists of these commonwealths are only biding their time. All they lack is the organization, and this the Bible Crusaders and the Supreme Kingdom are rapidly furnishing them.

Among the institutions of the United States that have contributed most generously to the evidences for evolution, and to the education of the general public to a better appreciation of the contributions of the theory of evolution to the progress of the human race, Yale now stands foremost. On September 7, 1926, eighty eminent members of the Cambridge University Medical Society heard Dr. Dudley J. Morton of the Yale department of surgery discuss "The Relation of Evolution to Medicine" (published in *Science*, October 22nd). Dr. Morton pointed out that:

> "The problem of evolution permeates every fundamental branch of medical education in such a manner as to signify that it represents a most important and unexplored source of biological knowledge which should prove of inestimable value to future medicine.

"After the anatomist has familiarized himself with the structures of the human body, he immediately finds himself plunged into the problem of evolution. Why? Because in his search for advanced knowledge he must naturally turn his attention toward their original source and attempt to learn the history of their development. . . .

"It is only by enlisting the aid of geology, palaeontology, and the allied sciences that we may hope to gain a true perspective of the phenomena of evolution. . . .

"I believe that I may state without fear of contradiction from a single one of them that fully 100 per cent. of all those to whom we owe our important advances in medicine are not only fully assured of the fact of evolution, but in addition are strongly convinced that the scope and rate of our future advances bear a direct ratio with our better understanding of the biological laws which have guided its course. . . .

"If it were commonly known how thoroughly medical science ratified the phenomenon of evolution and if the public had a true realization of how intimately this phenomenon is correlated with the present interests and the future progress of medicine, there would surely be far less controversy concerning it among laymen."

OHIO

That certain sections of even so enlightened a state as Ohio are not free from the virus of Fundamentalism is indicated by the fact that on July 17, 1925, the Board of Education dropped biology from the curriculum of the East Liverpool High School. The reason given for this action was the high cost of equipment necessary for the course; but the actual reason was probably fear of Fundamentalist criticism. The International News Service said the decision was made as a result of "the evolution controversy in the Scopes trial at Dayton."

On his return to Ohio, on July 30, 1925, from the Dayton trial, Prof. Maynard M. Metcalf, past president of the American Society of Zoologists and of the Ohio Academy of Sciences, issued a warning to his native state to squelch any movement that threatened "freedom of education and religious thinking." If such a law as the anti-evolution law of Tennessee is upheld, he said, "education is doomed and it would mean a return to the dark ages."

But, it seems, no anti-evolution law is needed in Ohio; an ever-prying and watchful school board stands guard over the pupils through a method of inquisition worthy of the Middle Ages. David H. Pierce, formerly a public school teacher in Ohio (now a journalist in Cleveland), shows clearly how the heavy hand of Fundamentalism grips the public schools through the teachers. In an article entitled "Religion in the Public Schools" (*Haldeman-Julius Monthly*, December, 1926, pages 67–69), Mr. Pierce tells us that "one of the principal requirements for entering the teaching profession in America (outside of a few of the larger communities) is to be able to pass a religious test"—examples of which are given. After satisfying the board that he is willing to "conform to the *mores* of the most stupid in the community," the inquisition continues from time to time by means of a form of questioning which makes acceptance of Bible myths and legends as historically true the measure of a teacher's fitness to instruct pupils in modern science. Mr. Pierce gives "a collection of questions hurled at teachers in the course of several years." Some of them, he says, are from his own experience, first in Wheeling, West Virginia, and later (as I understand

him) in Akron, Ohio, while others were given to him "by former colleagues." To quote:

"How do you reconcile the Freudian theory that dreams are unfulfilled wishes with the dreams that Joseph interpreted? Did Pharaoh wish for famine? . . .

"If you believe that man descended from animals, how about Adam and Eve? What animals did they come from?

"You told us in hygiene class not to believe too much in evangelists who go about healing people by faith. Yet I know a woman cured of paralysis by one of them. He prayed for her. Are you opposed to prayer?

"You are telling us that by exercising intelligence we can eliminate poverty from the world. The Bible says that the poor will be always with us. If you think there will be no poor people, you are opposed to the Bible.

"If you think that machinery will take the place of hard work, what about the statement that you must produce bread by the sweat of your brow?

"In giving us the geological periods you forgot to mention the flood Noah was in. How far back was that? . . .

"You have been quoting figures to prove that people live longer now than they used to. But back in Bible times a man lived to be over nine hundred years old. How can you say they live longer now?

"How can we believe that war will be abolished when the Bible says 'There shall be wars and rumors of wars'?"

Such foolish questions, asserts Mr. Pierce, are asked by pupils in hundreds of places between the Atlantic and the Pacific.

"If you are a teacher and are anxious to be dismissed 'for cause,' answer them with the intelligence required of any human being above the grade of moron."

At Columbus, on August 24, 1925, the Ku Klux Klan

held a national council meeting, at which the Klans of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan and Kentucky supported a proposal "to check the spread of Agnosticism within the Protestant Church." That by "Agnosticism" the Klan meant Modernism, is evidenced by the speech of Grand Dragon Clyde W. Osborne of the Ohio Realm, who said:

"Our quarrel is not with the church on the whole, but with certain leaders within the church who are responsible for the wave of unbelief that is spreading throughout the country. . . . In twenty-five years there will be no Protestant group in this country, unless the dry rot of Agnosticism within the Protestant Church is checked. The Klan has accomplished the first phase of its work—that of arousing public conscience to the menace of un-American control of American institutions. It is time now to turn to the second phase—the battle against the greater menace within the Protestant ranks."

In similar spirit, at about the same time, *The New Menace*, organ of another branch of the Klan, remarked editorially:

"Personally the writer—and he believes that 99 $^{99}/_{100}$ per cent. of reasoning people are with him—is satisfied with the story of the Creation as set out in the Christian Bible. . . . He had much rather believe—gets much more comfort out of the thought—that he is made in the image of his Creator—your God and my God—than to ever consider the suggestion that he is the descendant of one of the monkey tribe—or of any other animal or thing. Haven't you?

"If the evolutionists are getting ready to produce proof that our forefathers—way, way back—really were monkeys—*let's get together and Ku Klux them before their proof gets before the public*—let's quit 'chattering' about it and *act*—let's stop them from *monkeying* with such subjects."

Evidently the Modernists and the evolutionists are to be "Ku Kluxed" together!

Truly, as the Rev. John Malick, of Cincinnati, said:

"Under high-sounding names, we are being lured back to the very thing that our Republic was made to prevent. The arm of government is gradually extending over the field where the dictates of conscience and religion alone should operate. By whom are we being lured back? By just the same kind of power that did it before, an ecclesiastical combination. One could name over all the legislation that threatens these fundamental liberties of conscience, and he would find they all go back to one source. In one place they were all born, all nurtured, all forced into law, and the leaders who force them into law become the enforcers, the interpreters, and the profiteers of these laws when they are passed. Politically now, we are in the hands not of statesmen, but of ecclesiasts. Those who represent us are looking not to the whole free people, but to this ecclesiastical organization to see which way they should move. . . . They variously are called Leagues, Church Committees, Lord's Day Alliances, and Watch and Ward Societies, but they are all one in fact, parts of one purpose with about the same personnel. . . . The cleric has come into power, a new cleric, American born and bred. Those who are concerned for liberty need not be much disturbed about the Anarchists. They need to look to these Committees on our life and morals of these dominant political churches of America."

MICHIGAN

On September 1, 1925, the Rev. Dr. Lynn H. Hough, pastor of the Central Methodist Episcopal Church of Detroit, and former president of Northwestern University, was accused of heresy "because he placed Darwin on as high a plane as Jesus" in a sermon. Dr. William H.

Phelps, editor of *The Michigan Christian Advocate*, was accused of approving Dr. Hough's position. The charge, made by a Fundamentalist minister, Dr. Levi Bird, of Port Sanilac, was not upheld and Dr. Hough retains his pastorate.

The Flint Daily Herald said editorially (quoted by *The American Mercury*, February, 1925):

"Any man of the twentieth century who will . . . stand for evolution is not, despite his appearance from a physical standpoint, a member of the race of humankind. . . . The very fact that the sun rises in the east every morning and sets in the west every evening, is sufficient proof for MOST OF US that there is a God. Why doesn't it set in the north once in a while for a change? *Because that isn't God's Plan.*"

In the city of Grand Rapids, evolution has an able and eloquent champion in the person of the Rev. Dr. Alfred Wesley Wishart (already mentioned), minister of the Fountain Street Baptist Church. During the past four years Dr. Wishart has published a number of booklets defending freedom of thought and freedom in teaching, and has dealt Bryanism some hard blows. He feels, to quote his own words ("Evolution and Religion," page 26) that:

"The church has a responsibility in this matter, because by many of its theological teachings it is keeping alive errors that close the mind to truth and prevent men from knowing reality, and, therefore, from entering into the possession of the new knowledge that could make life superior in every respect. These may be hard words but they are not expressed in a bitter spirit. I was brought up in religion and I believe in religious organizations. I believe the church does a vast deal of good. But when I read the history of organized re-

ligion and when I see how the good of the world has been impeded and how progress has been obstructed by ignorance, prejudice and the religious blindness of men, I cannot help but feel that we have a great foe not only outside of religion, but within it. . . .

"The scientific study of the Bible strips away from the real truth of the book all the trappings that interfere with its power and with its influence. We see the book in its true light, when we understand how it came to be and when we distinguish between the different kinds of religion and the different views of religion in the book."

As former Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes finely said in his address at Detroit as retiring president of the American Bar Association (September 2, 1925):

"If we have any assurance for the future, it lies in education.

But reliance upon education will be vain if we do not maintain the freedom of learning. . . . The most ominous sign of our time, as it seems to me, is the indication of an intolerant spirit. . . . We justly prize our safeguards against abuses, but they will not last long if intolerance gets under way. If progress has taught us anything, it is the vital need of the freedom of learning. . . .

"It would be serious enough if interference with education found its motive in the desire to control intellectual activity in the interest of former intellectual concepts, but it is far more serious when these endeavors are for the purpose of controlling the pursuit of knowledge in what is supposed to be the interest of religion by aiming at the protection of creed or dogma."

WISCONSIN

While the people of Wisconsin are not likely to be deeply impressed by the propaganda of the anti-ev-

olutionists, nevertheless even this enlightened commonwealth is not without its reactionary Fundamentalists.

An attempt was made in 1925, by the Rev. H. J. Aitcherson, of Poynette, and two others, to convict the Rev. Dr. George E. Hunt, pastor of Christ Presbyterian Church, in Madison, of being a heretic and an evolutionist—specifically, among other charges, of disbelieving in the Virgin Birth and the Creation Story in Genesis. He was acquitted by a judicial committee of the Presbyterian Synod in convention at Camp Cleghorn (November 3rd), but an appeal was taken to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, which apparently failed.

Dr. Edward Alsworth Ross, of the University of Wisconsin, has been severely taken to task by Dr. W. B. Riley in his entertaining book, "Inspiration or Evolution?" (pages 105–106). The famous sociologist is indicted on many counts, among which are the following:

> "Professor Ross reduces the teachings of the Bible to a level with 'wizardry,' speaks of a 'chosen people,' evidently meaning Israel, as 'a legend,' of 'an ethics basing its norm on human nature and the nature of the social organization' and as 'superseding the alleged commands of Deity'—(mark the adjective, 'alleged commands of Deity'—) 'the precepts of ancient sages, the customs of the fathers, and edicts of Mrs. Grundy.' In other words, Mrs. Grundy and God's commands are on a common level with Professor Ross (page 293). . . . On page 305 he says, 'Put together all the effects of all the Atheists who have ever lived and they have not done so much harm to Christianity and the world as has been done by the narrow-minded conscientious men who persecuted Roger Bacon.' "

Dr. Riley is determined that an anti-evolution law and an anti-disrespect-for-the-Bible statute shall be enacted in Wisconsin.

MINNESOTA

In 1922 Bryan made an address in Minnesota asking its Legislature to eliminate from tax-supported schools "this anti-scientific and anti-Scriptural theory of the origin of man and of the universe." Although anti-evolution agitation has been strong in the state ever since, the legislators have obdurately refused to cripple the public schools by laws favoring Fundamentalist theology.

Nevertheless, Dr. Riley and his cohorts regard Minnesota as about ready to adopt an anti-evolution law. Dr. Riley, who is pastor of the First Baptist Church of Minneapolis, and Executive Secretary of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association, recently announced that "the Fundamentalists make up nine tenths of the population of this state." The University of Minnesota, which refused Dr. Riley permission to speak under its auspices, stands as a bulwark against the encroachments of the fanatics.

Speaking of four text-books used in the University of Minnesota, Dr. Riley alleged that:

> "Every one of them denies the Christian faith, feeling that the defense of Darwinism is not sufficient without so doing, and some of their sentences are the most sacrilegious and scornful" that he had "ever seen in print."

The learned theologian found Dr. F. Stuart Chapin's "Introduction to the Study of Social Evolution, Pre-

historic Period" to be particularly objectionable. Instances of Satanic teaching are quoted by Dr. Riley, and among those mentioned are the following:

> " 'The brute mind was gradually converted into the human intelligence.' 'Morals are nothing but the conviction implanted by the social group in the minds of its members of the propriety of the manner of life imposed by it upon them.' 'So in the individual and in the social mind was born at last the idea of self, or personality, as a conscious life, soul or spirit, dwelling in the body, but distinct and separable from it.' This quotation [*sic*] he follows with a discussion that shows he has no confidence whatever that the soul is immortal."

Dr. Riley objects also to all the sociological writings of Prof. Charles A. Ellwood, as previously noted; and to Burch and Patterson's "American Social Problems," a high school text. Of the latter he says:

> "Let me say that the North High School [Minneapolis] has one professor who refuses to hold recitations on certain chapters in this book."

Almost as eloquent as the Commoner, and quite as ignorant of science and the methods of science, Dr. Riley has more recently turned his oratorical batteries on Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota—an institution which has done much for the spread of culture in the state. At a meeting of the annual Minnesota Baptist Conference (October 13, 1926), he submitted a resolution demanding withdrawal of church support from Carleton College. He charged that the majority of the faculty members teach the theory of evolution, "contrary to the belief of the Baptist Church." The fact that many Baptists throughout the country are outspoken

evolutionists did not dampen the ardor of the eloquent Riley. The resolution was referred to the executive board of the church for a report the year following.

Minnesota Fundamentalists are much wrought up over certain statements made (at a camp-meeting in Des Plaines, Illinois, July 25, 1926) by the Methodist Bishop Charles Edward Locke, of St. Paul.

"I have been asked," said the Bishop, "whether I believe in evolution. Well, I don't know very much about it. 'In the beginning, God' is my faith, and then if the Creator found it desirable to use a method of development rather than one peremptory fiat in making the world, I can see no objection. Do not oak trees and men come to-day by evolution? . . .

"Someone else asks me if I think I was descended from a monkey. Well, to tell the truth, I don't care where I came from. I know I am here with a chance at the ecstatic adventure of life."

The attitude of Minnesota Fundamentalists in general is illustrated by a Conference of Minnesota preachers, representing Baptist, Congregational, Presbyterian and Lutheran churches, passed October 26, 1922:

"Whereas, The evolutionary hypothesis has come to be accepted by many American teachers, and is increasingly taught in the public schools of Minnesota, including high schools, our state normals, and state universities, and

"Whereas, this hypothesis, after sixty-three years of study, remains wholly unproven, and has increasingly shown itself to be a foe to the Christian faith, denying as it does the veracity of the scriptures,

"Therefore be it resolved, that we, citizens of Minnesota, representing thousands of our fellow-citizens, hereby utter our protest against this propaganda of infidelity, palmed off in the name of science, and we call upon the trustees of

state institutions to demand of teachers a cessation of such teaching and the removal from our schools of such textbooks as favorably present the same."

It may well be that Minnesota is on the verge of a real anti-evolution war, and that the current session of the State legislature will be the scene of an "earnest" crusade against what Dr. Riley eloquently describes as the "God-denying, Christ-repudiating, Bible-scorning" theory of evolution, which has, he says, "well nigh wrecked every land that has adopted it." Abyssinia, Afghanistan, Persia, Arabia, Egypt, Siam, Burma, and a few other countries have so far escaped the blighting effects of the invasion of this devastating doctrine, hence are not "well nigh wrecked"!

The situation in Minnesota at this writing resembles that of a pot about to boil, but (perhaps because it is a "watched pot") not yet boiling. Dr. Riley keeps threatening to introduce his bill; he is engaging in debates (notably with Dr. Arvid Reuterdahl of St. Paul) and speeches in which he prophesies its immediate introduction; the Lutherans of Minnesota have pledged him their support and through the Rev. H. W. Neunaber of Triumph-Monterey have appealed to State Senator Frank A. Day stating that seventy-five per cent. of the voters of his district want such a bill "and their opinion should and must be respected under all circumstances": and still the bill does not appear. As noted previously, Edward Young Clarke of the Supreme Kingdom is also concentrating his efforts on Minnesota at present (March, 1927).

Against the bill are most of the urban newspapers—prominent among them *The Minneapolis Tribune;*

Bishop Locke, who says he is no "funda-monkey-ist"; the state university; and all the organizations of scientists and liberals who have figured in the fight in other states. The Ulen (Minnesota) *Union* carried a long and forceful letter from George C. Ulen, a member of the family founding the town, but now a resident of Iowa; and many other protests have been written and spoken.*

NORTH DAKOTA

As long ago as 1922 the governor of North Dakota, Ragnvald Anderson Nestos (a Lutheran), "proclaimed against certain heresies being exploited in the university of that commonwealth, one of which is Darwinian evolution."

On February 5, 1927, Rep. L. O. Richardson of Adams county introduced in the North Dakota legislature a bill to bar from the schools any doctrine that teaches that man is of other than divine origin. The penalty was a fine of from $25 to $100 for each offense, violation of the act being a misdemeanor. This bill was killed in committee.

SOUTH DAKOTA

The anti-evolution crusade has now reached South Dakota. During May, 1926, the Rev. Albert H. Crombie,

* As this book goes to press, bills have been introduced in both houses of the Minnesota Legislature, and after an exciting public hearing have been defeated.

Fundamentalist pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Lead, made a strenuous effort to have C. C. Curran, principal of the Lead High School, dismissed on the double charge of being "an out-and-out evolutionist" and "a non-believer in the Virgin Birth of Christ." On the latter charge the Rev. Mr. Crombie demanded also that Mr. Curran be read out of the Presbyterian church. The principal has so far lost neither his position nor his church membership.

An Associated Press dispatch of October 11, 1926, throws further light on the progress of events in Lead, as well as on the approved tactics of Fundamentalism:

> "The Rev. A. H. Crombie of the Old Faith Presbyterian Church was bodily ejected from the Lead High School a few days ago by Principal C. C. Curran. The pastor was thrown out when he demanded entrance to general science and biology classes and the privilege of examining text-books in his effort to ascertain what principles were being taught.
>
> "Curran declared the Rev. Crombie was 'making a disturbance.' Crombie, an extreme Fundamentalist, claimed the privilege, 'as a taxpayer and citizen,' of examining the books and visiting classes to see whether pupils were being taught 'Modernist heresies.'"

Since then, Crombie has been found guilty of insubordination and conduct unbecoming a minister, and removed from the ministry. He has appealed to the State Synod, claiming that he is being persecuted by "the forces of Modernism"; but he is not likely to be upheld, as his own church voted him out, and padlocked the doors against him when he refused to leave.

The Methodist minister of Spearfish, near Lead, tried to emulate Mr. Crombie by viciously attacking the Spear-

fish Normal School. The net result was that he lost several faculty members from his church, and finally withdrew to other fields of usefulness.

A reliable correspondent assures me that there is small chance of an anti-evolution bill in South Dakota, for the reason that the state is near bankruptcy, and the legislature is devoting all its attention to trying to raise funds.

INDIANA

Indiana, one of the focal points of the Supreme Kingdom and the Ku Klux Klan, has so far escaped the ignominy of anti-evolution legislation; but in some of the rural districts teachers are forbidden to explain the theory to their pupils. On July 13, 1925, the township trustees of Licking and Blackford counties announced that any teacher found imparting the Darwinian doctrine to the students would be summarily discharged. Charles Pierce, trustee of Licking county, voiced the opinion of other trustees in saying: "There's nothing to it. It's all bosh. If there is any evolution, why hasn't man evolved to a higher grade of animal than he is now?" To which one might answer that it would certainly be far better for the Hoosier youth if their educational guardians had advanced another step or two!

One is reminded of a statute enacted by the Indiana Legislature in 1899. In that year the solons decided to make a new value for Pi compulsory and have it taught in Indiana schools. "Pi" has been accepted as an abbreviation for 3.141592 + since the days when the Egyptians built the Pyramids, being the ratio of the

circumference of a circle to the diameter. But a former school teacher of Indiana told the Legislature that Pi was 4, and offered the free use of his proof to the public schools.

"The free offer was accepted, a law was introduced, and it passed three readings in the upper house and two readings in the lower house before a scientist heard about it and succeeded after tremendous efforts in having the bill killed."

The Indiana State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Henry Noble Sherwood, did not hesitate to say, in an address before the National Education Association, at its mid-winter session in Washington, D. C. (1925–26), that only those teachers should be employed who are active in church work. In what church?

It was well for Luther Burbank that he did not choose Indiana instead of California for his work in improving vegetables, fruits and flowers; as witness an Associated Press dispatch from the town of Goshen:

"A. E. Kunderd, gladiolus grower of Goshen, has been banned from the strict orthodox church he attended. The church cast out Mr. Kunderd because authorities decided that in hybridizing his gladioli to produce new varieties he was interfering with the divine scheme of things."

In February, 1927, Dr. Walter Bundy, Professor of the English Bible at De Pauw University, a large Methodist institution at Greencastle, came under Fundamentalist fire at the meeting of the Indiana Methodist Episcopal Conference at Indianapolis. The attacks on Dr. Bundy center around his book, "The Psychic Health of Jesus," which the Fundamentalists consider heretical.

The fight is led by Taylor University, a small Methodist college at Upland, which because of its extreme Fundamentalism has never received the financial support given De Pauw. The Modernists claim that the Ku Klux Klan is back of the attacks, and that if they succeed in eliminating Dr. Bundy, they will feel strong enough to work for an anti-evolution law in Indiana.

We learn from Samuel W. Tait's informing article, "Indiana" (*The American Mercury*, April, 1926), that "while the civilized minority has been growing of age, the mob has been getting out of hand"; that while the minority is at least aware of the fact, "it is completely at a loss to know what to do." What it lacks chiefly is, Mr. Tait believes, precisely "what the intelligent minority lacks in every state in the great open spaces of the South and Middle West, namely, courage." It is "not eager enough to give battle fearlessly and without quarter."

Unless a compact organization of the instructed minority in Indiana is soon formed, and puts up a real fight, the Ku Klux Klan, under the banner of, or in close cooperation with, the Supreme Kingdom or the Bible Crusaders, will shortly completely overwhelm the forces of learning and culture in the Hoosier State—"more than any of the so-called farming states of the West and Northwest, the perfect bucolic commonwealth."

"Already," says Mr. Tait, "The general staff turns its forces upon the parapets, and attempts to destroy the accumulated learning of the ages. The death of Bryan, the Fundamentalist Pope, who was destined to lead on to such a sacred end, has caused a temporary lull in the fighting. But a new occupant for the Evangelical Vatican will be found, and the battle

will be resumed. Who . . . is so naïf as to imagine any limit to the triumphant march of the liberated yokel?"

Who, that is to say, is so naïf so long as that triumphal march is in solid phalanx against a scattered group of individualists, lacking organization, and unwilling to co-operate in any effort to create an organized force to meet the well-organized forces of ignorance?

IOWA

In an informing article on "Evolution—Fifty Years Ago," Carrie Chapman Catt (in *The Woman Citizen*, July 11, 1925) gives us an intimate picture of school life in Iowa "when Evolution was thirteen years old"—dating from the appearance of "The Origin of Species" (a somewhat misleading phrase, since the theory of evolution is hundreds of years older than Christianity). Mrs. Catt was then "an ordinary child in an ordinary high school in an ordinary Iowa town," and had not until then noticed the word evolution.

"What happened to me in that high school," she says, "must have happened to thousands of other ordinary boys and girls in equally ordinary schools and towns—fifty years ago. I cannot account for Mr. Bryan's escape. The instruction in our text-book was so conflicting that the feeblest mind could not fail to detect it. . . . Our text-book on general history . . . very appropriately began with its [the world's] creation, which was quite definitely dated as having occurred in an eventful week just six thousand years before. . . . A text-book on geology made a neat reconciliation between Evolution and Genesis and told us that the six days of the creation were not twenty-four-hour days but geologic ages and that the seventh day when God rested from his labors was the present age and that we were privileged to live in a perfected

world. A text-book on physical geography, however, outlined the theory of Evolution with no apology to Genesis and made the ages of creation much longer than did the text-book on geology, clinching its statements with illustrations of fossil animals and skulls of men dead a million years ago. No instructor was an evolutionist, I am sure, yet I left that high school with the idea that this earth of ours is a wonderful place with secrets untold but that the entire riddle would one day be worked out by science. . . .

"When Evolution was eighteen years old I went to the Iowa State College, founded only ten years before. I found everyone in charge from the president down to the janitor an evolutionist, with a single exception—the professor of English literature. . . . I now know that those instructors, young graduates of Harvard, Yale and Amherst, had passed through the peak of the storm and had emerged with the spirit of crusaders. We got Evolution in every classroom and laboratory. We gazed at it under microscopes and through telescopes. We saw it in crucibles, preserving alcohol and fossil skulls. When we arrived at sociology we learned that Evolution had seized the shaggy uncouth creature with but a few sounds for a language—primitive man—and under the lash of necessity had driven him through millions of years onward and upward until the highest and best of modern men are the climax. We learned that God does not rest on the seventh day, but that men are being driven onward now and that they will be driven in the future as in the past to climb higher whether they will or not.

"I left that college grounded in the faith that Evolution would allow no permanent harm to come to the race through its stupidity and blunders; that Evolution would move faster and avoid pitfalls if there were plenty of sensible 'evolutors' who would try to think straight and act accordingly. . . .

"I remember that a few years, three or four, after my graduation in 1880, the Mississippi Valley was visited by a series of cyclones. One of the first snipped off a corner of this science building at my college. Several Iowa papers hastened to pass on the charge that this was a certain act of Prov-

idence in punishment for having promulgated the atheistic doctrine of Evolution. A month later another tornado demolished several buildings of the most popular denominational school in the state and all the public ceased its comments on the retributions of Providence. I thought the controversy had ended. Apparently it only subsided."

And so, in truth, it had. In May, 1925, the Rev. C. P. Hojbierg, believing in evolution, was dismissed from the presidency of Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa. An Associated Press dispatch of June 14, 1925, said:

"Disbelief in the story of Jonah and the whale and many other stories of the Bible in their literal sense as the result of his leaning toward evolution is responsible for the defeat of Rev. C. P. Hojbierg, for six years president of the Danish Lutheran Church's seminary, Grandview College, of Des Moines. He was defeated for re-election at the synodical meeting in Omaha, Nebraska.

" 'It is true that I am an evolutionist,' he is quoted as saying. 'I expected defeat on account of it, but it is my belief and I shall go on teaching it. I disagree with William J. Bryan and many members of my own church that a man cannot be an evolutionist and a Christian at the same time.' "

Dr. Hojbierg, with Dr. Edwin Heyl Delk, of Philadelphia, has the honor of being one of the only two outspoken defenders of evolution and the newer theology who have come to my attention in the Lutheran faith, which boasts more than 2,500,000 communicants, divided into eighteen separate bodies, but all "at one" in their opposition to evolution. This is the fourth largest Christian denomination in the United States, only the Methodists, Baptists and Roman Catholics exceeding it in numbers. Its members will vote solidly with the Fun-

damentalists of other denominations wherever the question of evolution is put to a vote. According to Eldor Paul Schulze (*The American Mercury*, July, 1926), evolution has been attacked "in at least three Lutheran volumes."

> "One is a so-called scientific argument by a professor of theology. Another is a collection of mild essays. The third is a compilation of the statements of scientists [either "falsely so called" or real scientists who have long since departed this life] on the subject. The Lutheran periodicals are full of articles on it."

The Iowa Synod numbers 135,000 members, and hence does not, in itself, constitute a danger to freedom of teaching in that state; but the state as a whole is strongly Fundamentalist. It may be taken for granted that many Presbyterians of Iowa, for example, agree with the great majority of their Fundamentalist brethren that evolution should be barred from the state's schools. In any event, it is to be noted that the Synods of the Presbyterian Church have been instructed to "see to it that nothing contrary to the principles of the United Presbyterian Church is taught in any educational institution under their care." This is interpreted by the editor of *The Crusaders' Champion* as "a ban on the teaching of evolution, for during the meeting of the Assembly a committee reported: 'Pagan teaching in schools, if not counteracted, would soon produce a generation of pagans' "—little suspecting, apparently, that the Fundamentalist creed is, almost word for word, unadulterated paganism in its most primitive form!

The council of the Seventh Day Adventists, meeting

in Des Moines, on October 13, 1926, passed a resolution, without a dissenting voice, denouncing evolution and evolutionists. The church's secretary, Victor B. Hawley, said that while there was some difference of opinion among Iowa Adventists as to whether the church should go on record as opposing the teaching of evolution in the public schools, the delegates were unanimous in their condemnation of evolutionary theory in general.

In Davenport, valuable educational work is being done by the Ethical Society, of which C. T. Lindley is president and J. F. Bredow secretary. But Iowa as a whole is probably ripe for plucking by the Fundamentalists.

Just what stand the majority of Iowa journals would take on the evolution question were the Fundamentalists to inaugurate an extensive campaign in that state, no one can say. At least one paper—*The Sioux City Journal*—has already expressed strong disapproval of such a politico-religious contest:

> "To declare an evolution war is to betray bigotry of the worst type. This is an age when human beings seek knowledge, when they are eager for the truth. It is evident that the anti-evolutionists, regardless of who they are and what church or creed they represent, have overlooked the fact that Providence endowed human beings with minds, evidence enough that God wished them to develop thought by seeking knowledge and to improve their chance in every way available within their powers.
>
> "An evolution war of this kind is unfair and un-American."

For some years prior to 1925, evolution had a valiant and brilliant champion in the pulpit of the First Unitarian Church of Des Moines, the Rev. Edmund Henry

Reeman (now of Vineland, New Jersey). When the late Mr. Bryan invaded various states with his anti-evolution nonsense, his tirade was answered most ably by Mr. Reeman. He pointed out that evolution, far from being a "mere guess" of scientists, or the product of "atheistic propaganda,"

"is based upon the actual observation of concrete facts. Men did not originally abandon the theory of the direct creation of the world and its various life forms by God in six days because they had any quarrel with the idea of God as formerly held. . . . They abandoned this theory only after the discovery of a vast array of concrete facts which this theory did not explain and would not fit."

Truly has it been said: "The future belongs to those of the open mind and the true faith for all men in the open road of free inquiry."

NEBRASKA

In an address before the science section of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Middle West, Prof. H. F. Osborn stated that on a recent journey through the state of Nebraska he was:

"amazed to learn from an extremely able high school teacher in the western part of the state that the word evolution was not to be used at all; so powerful is the influence of a certain class of theological teachers on their congregations, so strong is the influence of their congregations with their representatives in the state legislature, and so potent are these representatives in affecting state appropriations for education, that no teacher in the whole state of Nebraska is entirely free to be sincere but is more or less obliged to dissemble his real beliefs" (*School and Society*, January 9, 1926).

In so far as the high schools of Nebraska are concerned, this statement is entirely in agreement with the facts, with a few possible exceptions. But it does not apply to the University of Nebraska, as Professor Osborn was glad to learn later (*Science,* January 15 and February 19, 1926).

"In the state university," says Prof. Franklin D. Barker, "from the chancellor down to instructors, there has never been a 'hush' on the freest discussion and most open teaching of evolution."

In an interview in *The Omaha World-Herald* (May 22, 1925), the chancellor, Dr. Samuel Avery, said that at the state university evolution is taught "as a theory, not as a dogma." (Does this mean, "not as a fact"? And would teaching evolution as a fact, as a recognized process of nature, be "dogma"? We have theories of evolution—of its causes and methods,—true; but have we not also conclusive evidences of the *fact* of evolution, whatever our theories *about* evolution may happen to be? Why introduce the term "dogma" in relation to nature's obvious way of doing things?)

Professor Barker gives the following good news from Nebraska:

> "The departments of botany, geology, sociology and zoology teach evolution with the utmost freedom. Prof. E. H. Barbour, head of the department of geology. . . , says that 'in the geology department our only solicitude is for truth. We take facts as we find them. We hold that the truth is sacred above all things.' Professor Barbour gives a lecture on evolution each semester before some two thousand freshman students.
>
> "The department of zoology teaches evolution in every course and offers a special course each semester to a large group of students under the specific title of 'Evolution.'

"We recently addressed a large group of science teachers of the state on the subject 'Evolution an Inspiration.' All members of the university faculty from the chancellor down hope that evolution may be kept out of controversy and left in the realm of scientific truth."

From the concluding words of Professor Osborn's letter we are led to infer that Dr. Avery did not mean to imply that evolution was being taught at the state university *only* as a theory. In any event, Dr. Osborn says:

"What I intended to say is that no (school) teacher in the state is entirely free to be sincere.

"As regards the University of Nebraska, I am only too happy to learn from Professor Barker that I was mistaken and that the teaching of evolution as a law, no longer as a theory, is entirely free. I trust this will soon be the case among all the school teachers of the state of Nebraska, as well as among other school teachers all over the United States, to whom my address was especially directed."

KANSAS

Kansas will soon be among the benighted states to join the league against freedom in teaching—or even in reading. During the spring of 1925, patrons of School District 18, Jewell county, voted 14 to 5 to order a set of "The Book of Knowledge" burned. The books had been purchased by the school board in 1923, before the rural pastors had been inoculated with Bryanism. Commenting on this act of stupidity and fanaticism, *The New York World* said:

"From the report of the County Superintendent it appears that those who favored the destruction of the books had their plans all laid and were out in force when the annual meeting

was called. Other patrons, who did not care so much about evolution or any other theory, were not in attendance when the action was taken, it is said. The anti-evolution faction, which numbers about half the taxpayers in the district, is composed of an old-time sect of Friends, with tenets more rigid and beliefs more 'fundamental' than the modern Quakers."

A resident of Arkansas City, Kansàs, writes that:

"Preachers and editors are all fighting evolution and free thought. An evolutionist is looked upon as some kind of 'varmint.' There is not a day passes but you will hear men talking about evolution and the Bible."

An idea of the local feeling and of the intellectual caliber of the anti-evolutionists of rural Kansas may be gained from a printed Christmas card received by this gentleman, reading: "A monkey with a monkey face, without brains, guts or grace; the truth to you I'll tell. With all the infidels you'll be sent to hell."

The Wichita Daily Eagle, published by the Murdocks, rejoices in the formation of an aggressive Kansas group of "Crusaders" (the Defenders, of whom more later) to "fight the evolution theory."

The Rev. Albert R. Fiske, a liberal Presbyterian minister of Ottawa, Kansas, writes (in *The Haldeman-Julius Weekly*) of the formation of an anti-evolution society in that state:

"You are probably aware of the fact that the 'Defenders' have organized in Salina recently [written in January, 1926] for the purpose of combating the teaching of evolution in the schools of Kansas. . . . There is going to be a determined effort made in Kansas to rally the churches to the standard of Fundamentalism. . . .

"Most of our orthodox preachers are either preaching against evolution and will line up with the 'Defenders' or else they are afraid to champion the truth. Really, if this matter were submitted to a referendum vote in Kansas to-day, I think the state would side with Tennessee."

While attending, not long ago, a state-wide (annual) camp-meeting of the Pentecostals, held in Topeka, Walter Clare Martin, a writer and editor of Brooklyn, New York, found "three sets of prayers" in progress in "the Grove of God":

(1) A prayer to abolish irreligious books and magazines all over America.

(2) A prayer to defeat the repeal of the anti-cigarette law in Kansas—which was granted! [Mr. Martin is mistaken as to this.]

(3) A prayer to assist Congress and all the state legislatures in uprooting the doctrine of evolution from the public schools.

Mr. Martin noted that:

"Autos and motor trucks careened into camp, or out. . . . License plates from Oklahoma, Nebraska, Missouri and Arkansas revealed how far a chosen seed will blow to seek its proper soil."

(For a rather appalling "close-up" on the type of voters represented at this gathering of "the saved," see *The Haldeman-Julius Monthly*, August, 1926, pages 93–100.)

It is interesting to note, as the other side of the shield, that the following course is given in the Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina:

"Heredity and Evolution. A lecture course which deals with

the modern problems of biology in so far as they relate to theories of organic evolution and heredity. Eugenics is emphasized in the latter part of the course."

A more comprehensive course is offered at the Kansas State Agricultural College:

"Evolution and Heredity. This is a lecture and reading course dealing with the development of the idea of evolution; the evidence and the principal theories of the cause; problems of variation, heredity and experimental evolution."

Prof. William M. Goldsmith has been giving an excellent course in evolution at Southwestern College, Winfield, covering all the varied aspects and applications of the subject. Needless to say, the same is true of the state university. The effect of the elimination of such (typical) courses would be an extremely serious matter. As Dr. Goldsmith himself remarks ("Evolution and Christianity"):

"Since genetics and eugenics are parts of the great evolutionary processes of life, elimination of the whole, namely evolution, would obviously eliminate the constituent parts—genetics, eugenics, euthenics, ethics, sociology, etc. . . . Ellwood ('Sociology and Modern Social Problems') was evidently correct when he said, 'The thought of evolution now dominates ALL sciences—physical, biological, physiological and sociological.' "

A questionnaire submitted in 1923 to the biology students of Southwestern College (reported by Dr. Goldsmith), asking whether the teaching of evolution had affected their faith in Christianity, resulted in affirmative answers by two of the eighty-eight questioned, neg-

ative by sixty-six, and the answer that there had been no effect by twenty.

One cannot but wonder if the science teachers of the Kansas high schools, however, feel perfectly secure in interpreting the facts of geology and biology in the light of evolutionary theory. It was reported in the press of July 24, 1925, that Prof. John G. Scott, who taught a class in citizenship at the Kansas State Teachers College, was discharged "because of the evolutionary nature of his teaching." It was stated that "his pupils are in revolt" against his dismissal. A Los Angeles correspondent states that Professor Scott was discharged a few years ago by the trustees of the Pasadena, California, High School for teaching evolution. A former pupil of Professor Scott's writes:

> "Some of us considered him the most brilliant and the most successful teacher we had ever come across. His skill in arousing real interest and real thought in his young people was wonderful. When ousted from the Pasadena position his pupils there and parents to the number of five hundred signed a protest against it."

Actuated by the violent language of anti-evolutionist parsons, a fanatic in Kansas City, Kansas, is visiting the Public Library and systematically mutilating all books and periodicals which contain any endorsement of the theory of evolution. Two copies of Darwin's "Descent of Man" have been torn "from cover to cover," and each day—says an Associated Press dispatch, October 31, 1926—one or more books pertaining to evolution have been disfigured. "To show his contempt for the authors of these works the vandal has scribbled quotations from

the Bible on the fly-pages of the books." A special meeting of the board of education was called to take action, but so far (March, 1927), the mutilator "has eluded all traps to catch him."

"It is not the yellow peril that threatens our country, nor is it a war peril," remarks *The Truth Seeker* (December 19, 1925). "It is a religious peril. Significant and sinister are the signs of the times.

"The Scopes trial did not create a condition. It merely revealed one, and blind is he who cannot see it. Tennessee is but one of the southern states and they are all similar, at least religiously. They have a population of twenty-six millions, or about one fourth that of the United States. There is the breeding-ground of the throw-back type. Yet this breed is widely scattered throughout the northern states. The religious disease of Fundamentalism is rapidly becoming epidemic.

"In the northern cities capacity crowds fill the churches where these recrudescent preachers of the dark ages exhort and perspire. Kansas, obsessed Kansas, is planning a campaign to strangle intelligence and assassinate learning, and has announced its intention to employ such leading exemplars of superstition and ignorance as Norris of Texas, Riley of Minnesota, and Straton of New York."

A resident of Kansas, S. A. Bassett, states that in his county seat town there is:

"A Training School for Public School Teachers in the art of teaching religion to the children of the public schools, and it is to be, not the religion of ethics or business or of morals, but the religion of Christ. 'Classes in the life of Christ, training in worship, in devotions,' this is the whole of the matter; and a public school teacher must attend these training schools or be in the class that are ostracized and black-balled so far as further public employment as teachers is concerned.

"Already in our historical classes we meet the efforts of teachers to bolster up weak Bible history, and from now on the student who wants a free mind to form his own conclusions as to the trend of evidence from his outside reading will be looked upon with disfavor. . . .

"We are reaching a point where the work being done by these teachers becomes more and more the work of propagandists, of fanatical enthusiasts, who will allow no other constructions of history than that put upon it by the religionist of Christ. And no one objects. No one protests, and the plan is being laid as deftly and scientifically as the line of battle in a great military campaign."

The most active representative of the Crusaders in Kansas is one Gerald B. Winrod, formerly a clerk for the Wichita Gas Company. In his announcement of the second annual convention of the Defenders, held in his native city of Wichita, November, 1926, Winrod described himself as a "nationally known lecturer on scientific and religious subjects." He boasted that he had addressed no fewer than 300,000 persons in Kansas alone, and had traveled constantly from state to state, battering down the ramparts of the evolutionists. Winrod, as organizer and executive secretary of the Kansas division of the Crusaders, opened the convention, in the South Lawrence Avenue Baptist Church. Arch W. Jarrell, who attended the meetings gives us some interesting "close-ups" on the proceedings (*Haldeman-Julius Monthly*, January, 1927):

"He [Winrod] appointed the chairman, a fire-eating Methodist parson from Plainville named Morton Miller. He appointed the committees, making himself chairman of one or two, and he gave to those committees the resolutions which they were to pass. The resolutions were adopted by the committees

and by the convention, in absolutely cut-and-dried fashion. . . . "The convention rang with sonorous attacks on evolution. . . . The grand pooh-bah of the convention was, of course, Dr. W. B. Riley. . . . He shouted, he told stale jokes, he poked heavy-handed fun at the evolutionists. . . . The Rev. Mr. Miller, chairman of the convention, predicted that due to evolution the Orient will sweep the Occident and conquer the western world. . . . Seven text-books used in the Kansas schools were condemned because of the space given in them to evolutionary theory."

They were: "History of Europe," by Robinson and Breasted; "Mind and Its Education," by Betts; "Elementary Psychology," by Phillips; "Third and Fourth Generation," by Downing; "The New Biology," by Smallwood, Reveley and Bailey; "Elementary Biology," by Gruenberg; and "Civic Biology," by Hunter.

"Civilized men," concluded Mr. Jarrell, "should not look too lightly upon such organizations. We are likely, one of these days to find an anti-evolution law staring at us out of the statute books. For human beings are not notably intelligent."

Kansas is surely leading the way toward a virtual union of State and Church, under Fundamentalist control.

OKLAHOMA

By a vote of 87 to 2, the Oklahoma House of Representatives voted (February 21, 1923) for the free textbook bill, which carried an amendment prohibiting the teaching of "the Darwinian theory." In March, 1923, the Senate, concurring with the decision of the lower house, voted 16 to 12 to exclude the theory of evolution

from the state's text-books. It was provided by this action that:

> "No copyright shall be purchased or text-book adopted that teaches the materialistic conception of history, i. e., the Darwin theory of creation versus the Bible account of creation" [!].

This clause was quietly repealed by a law which went into effect on June 26, 1926. No sooner did the Fundamentalists discover that the religious clause had been eliminated from the state's code than agitation for restoration of an anti-evolution statute was begun, and is now in progress. Petitions were circulated urging the governor to call a special election to refer the bill to the people. The required number of signatures was not secured, the question being complicated in Oklahoma by the economic aspects involved in the Free Text-Book Law. However, according to the State Librarian of Oklahoma, the referendum on restoration of the anti-evolution clause of the law was to have been "decided at the next general election." So far as I can learn, no change was effected by the election.

However, on January 13, 1927, a straight anti-evolution bill was introduced into the Oklahoma House of Representatives by Reps. C. D. Webber, A. N. Leecraft, W. R. Trent, and others. It provided for a fine of from $100 to $500 for the teaching of "any theory that denies the story of the Divine creation as taught in the Bible and teaches instead that man has descended from a lower order of animals."

In spite of all its sponsors, this bill, although it was reported "do pass" by the educational committee, was,

on motion of Rep. David M. Logan of Okmulgee, killed on February 25th by a vote of 46 to 30. The vote was therefore almost as close as that in Missouri. A motion to reconsider was tabled.

A catalogue of the University of Oklahoma shows that —until recently, at any rate—the following course was being given:

> "Evolution: The evidences and factors of evolution; its relations to mankind; problems of heredity, variation, and development; the aims, methods, and results of experimental evolution."

The attitude of many present-day Oklahomans was voiced, in 1923, while the bill was under discussion in the House, by a member who, pounding his desk, roared: "I promised my people at home that if I had a chance to down this here hellish Darwin I would do it!"

The Crusaders are rejoicing in the fact that while evolution is not at present outlawed in Oklahoma, the Nuyaka Indian School, of Okmulgee, has adopted the anti-evolution resolution which was passed at the Baptist Convention in Houston, Texas.

What is more important, from the Fundamentalist standpoint, is the fact that the subject of evolution is never mentioned nowadays by teachers of biology in the high schools of Oklahoma. It is only through private conversations that the more intelligent people can obtain an expression of the views of their instructors on this subject. The statements they make in the class-room would never indicate that they are evolutionists.

Says Clarice Cunningham, in writing of her experi-

ences in the high school and in the University of Oklahoma (*Haldeman-Julius Monthly*, August, 1926, pages 33–38):

"I chafed more under this bondage of silence than they did. It seems to me that those two [heterodox] instructors, with their influence and freedom from responsibility to anyone other than themselves, could have made an impression in favor of straighter thinking. But they made me see that the sudden termination of their teaching career in case they attempted anything of that sort would counteract the impression. So I took their reticence as a necessary evil, a condition which in the nature of things could not be avoided, and modeled my own conduct upon it."

She looked forward to the day when she would enter the state university, "where science is taught"—so she thought—"without bunk," where "intelligent professors were allowed to say what they pleased," in a "free-thinking, progressive institution." Had not a speaker from a sectarian college—at a commencement exercise in an Oklahoma town—advised the graduating students not to attend the university, with its "heartless, godless rationalism"? There indeed she had a course in zoology "which presented in a careful manner the evidences of evolution. The professor discussed the embryological and structural development with illustrative and experimental data that . . . could not reasonably have been doubted." But of the fifteen students in the class—eight of whom were zoology majors—Miss Cunningham alone accepted the theory as applied to man as well as to the lower animals! One girl accepted "animal evolution," but "the rest of the class was definitely hostile toward this girl and myself for accepting the word of the

professor in preference to the word of God." Of such are the future voters of Oklahoma!

COLORADO

Two years or more ago, the principal of a high school in Colorado, in joining the Science League of America, asked that the membership in this pro-evolution organization should be kept confidential (the League has had similar requests from teachers in many parts of the country, evidencing the way in which the Fundamentalists have intimidated the teaching profession). "Were my views on evolution made public," this applicant wrote, "it is doubtful if my position could be retained" —and this despite the fact that no attempt has so far been made in Colorado to outlaw evolution by legislative enactment.

But the question has been brought forward by Fundamentalist orators much more prominently in the recent past, with the result that, on June 10, 1926, C. O. Whitenack was dismissed as principal of the Niwot school (nine miles from Boulder). *The Denver News* of June 11th carried an item from which the following statement by Mr. Whitenack is quoted. Addressing the school board, he said:

> "I don't teach as much evolution as is in your eighth grade reader. I have nothing but kindly feelings for you members of the board personally, but for the opposition to my evolutionary views I have nothing but contempt. Why grown-up people should hold such primitive and refuted notions is to me a source of wonder and amusement.
>
> "The real issue in this controversy is freedom of discussion in the class-room. Take that away and you may as well convert the school buildings into monasteries.

"The trouble with you is your steam-heated imaginations. You read a passage in the Bible and turn your imagination loose and the result you get is truly marvellous. You are always sure that the great God of the universe, the creator of three hundred million suns and a billion planets, is right at your elbow telling you the product of your imagination is his revealed will.

"The facts are that you know nothing whatever of evolution or the grandeur of the doctrine, nor do you know your Bible."

The Rocky Mountain News (Denver) states that the discharge of Whitenack "created a furor in Niwot," but that a majority of the school patrons stood solidly behind the school board.

The Denver Labor Bulletin takes a rather gloomy view of the encroachments of the Fundamentalists in Colorado. Although they have not yet made the teaching of evolution a crime in that state,

"Their somber garbs begloom the landscape and their bemoaning saddens the eventide. . . . Do we come to a time when there must be another grand contest with the witch-burners? Who knows?

"What everyone knows is that the stark, gangling form of the bigot, the professional good man pious above all human possibility, goes hither and yon among us, powerful, dominating, dictatorial, threatening upon the steps of our legislatures, ordering at the doors of our courts, beating upon our heads in our pursuits of pleasure, smirking at our clean romances, bludgeoning our educators, drawing down about human heads, wherever possible, the black mask of darkness and narrowness and fear and hatred."

UTAH

Utah being virtually a Theocratic State—470 Mormons, as compared with only six Protestants, in each

1000 of the population, by one statistical survey—the theory of evolution is not taught in its public schools. I was told by a former resident of Salt Lake City that the chairs of geology and biology in the state university are filled by Mormons only.

H. K. Young pertinently asks:

"Will Utah wait until the Supreme Court of the United States rules on the Scopes case, or will it assume the decision of the lower court will be sustained and go right ahead and pass a law forbidding the teaching of anything in opposition to the sacred facts set forth in the Holy Book of Mormon? [The Scopes case, of course, will reach the Federal Court.]

"Will New Mexico and Louisiana overlook the opportunity to strengthen the Roman Catholic Church by making it a crime to use any other Bible than the Catholic Bible or teach anything contrary to the views of the Catholic Church?

"Will Minnesota, Wisconsin and North Dakota be outdone by these, or will they give the teachings of Martin Luther such protection that all who do not believe will move?

"What power will prevent any of these things from happening if the Supreme Court sustains the Scopes decision and is thereby prevented from blocking similar moves by other states? What is to prevent the states from increasing the penalties to death?"

At the semi-annual conference of the Mormon Church, held in Salt Lake City, October 4, 1926, Apostle Orson F. Whitney stated that:

"The discovery of America by Columbus and the signing of the Declaration of Independence were God's way of establishing the true religion—that of the Latter Day Saints (Mormons)."

Apostle Whitney quoted from the Declaration of Independence and compared the government of the United States with the government of his church. In this same spirit, following their custom of "baptizing the dead," the Mormons have already baptized Washington and Franklin (both Deists) as Latter Day Saints! Doubtless this is all very shocking to the good Fundamentalists who claim that the republic was founded, not upon the Book of Mormon, but upon the Bible.

NEW MEXICO

When the Crusaders are ready to invade New Mexico, they will probably find the majority of the voters prepared to endorse their campaign against evolution—or what they are now being told is the theory of evolution. An editorial in *The Roswell Daily Recorder* (April 7, 1926) informs its subscribers that all evolutionists are Atheists. It admits, however, that not all "the followers of the so-called scientific view of creation and life are Bolsheviks." It concedes that many scientists are "sincere and patriotic Americans who have been lured away from their belief in Jesus Christ to a belief in man-made theories, so-called science, which have changed frequently within the memory of many now living." Evidently the learned editor thinks that an essential element of a reasonable theory would be fixity—incapacity for further development.

So far only ignorance is involved. But *The Daily Recorder* now goes in for deliberate misrepresentation—deception of its readers, some of whom may look to the

editor of their paper for honest guidance. He tells them that science, as such, "tells us that there is no God." His readers may not know that such a statement is palpably false. Science deals only with things that can be weighed, measured, manipulated, examined, investigated. The scientist, as such, does not deal with metaphysical or theological problems.

"There is not a single iota of proof of any kind that any theories of evolution are more than *mere imaginings*. . . . There is no law anywhere that prevents scientists from writing and speaking on their theories, scientific or otherwise, but there should be a law in every state that will prevent them from taking the youthful and immature minds of the children of America and teaching them that there is no God. . . . The time has come when the public schools should be barred to the spread of propaganda, whether it be anti-Christian or what not"—pro-Fundamentalist propaganda being evidently excepted!

From which example, and one or two more I have observed in rural New Mexico papers,—such as the curious *Glen Rio Tribune*—it may be seen that the Fundamentalist seeds have been and are being sown even in a state so removed from the center of things as New Mexico.

ARIZONA

No overt attempts to abolish evolutionary teaching in Arizona have so far been made. But this should not be taken as proof that the Knights of Darkness are not at work in this state. A personal letter from a resident of Tucson, formerly active in school work in Michigan, says:

"There are several ministers in this city who are fanatics on the question of evolution and are doing their utmost to embarrass the professors in the state university and the teachers in the high schools. They are conducting an aggressive campaign to forbid the teaching of evolution and to take out all text-books which endorse or favor the theory, and to compel the reading of the Bible in all educational institutions. I have had considerable experience in combating this propaganda in my own state also."

On the whole, it would seem quite unlikely that a majority of anti-evolution legislators could be elected in the progressive state of Arizona, even should this commonwealth become infected with an army of imported Crusaders or Defenders. And the liberal Gov. George W. P. Hunt, recently declared re-elected for the sixth consecutive term, could be depended on to veto any such bill were it passed.

MONTANA

That the reaction toward Fundamentalism is being felt even among the buttes of Montana is made evident by the political platform of Arthur Babbitt, of Livingston. In the fall campaign of 1926, Mr. Babbitt ran as an independent candidate for the state legislature, receiving one third of the votes cast. In a preliminary announcement, he told the voters that he was a Rationalist, and that if elected he would oppose all measures that savored of an approach to union of Church and State, including the exclusion of the teaching of evolution.

It is interesting to note that the Montana Wesleyan University offers its students an excellent course in evolution, under the head, however, of "Genetics." But the

catalogue states, under this head, that "the fact of evolution will be discussed," and that the theories of Lamarck, Darwin, Weismann, and De Vries will be explained. "Organic Evolution" is the title of a similar course given in the University of Montana.

Fundamentalist leaders are citing Montana as one of their next objectives, but so far no anti-evolution bill has been introduced there.

OREGON

A press dispatch from Roseburg, Oregon, dated June 1, 1925, throws light on the cultural status of small towns of that state:

> "Modernist teachings and evolution have brought a hubbub in school affairs in this little Quaker city of 2,000 persons and twenty-two churches. Three high school teachers have resigned in protest against the modernistic tendencies of the new principal, James Hamilton. One of them is Miss Mildred Ferguson. Her father, C. C. Ferguson, chief of police, is credited with saying that no daughter of his would teach school where the principal 'believed in evolution and smoked cigarettes.'"

It may be recalled that in 1922 the Oregon Legislature passed a law—under the lash of the Ku Klux Klan—requiring all children below the ninth grade to attend public schools. In 1925 this law was declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court.

Oregon justly boasts several educational institutions of high academic standing, and the state university, at Eugene, with professors on its teaching staff of national reputation in their several lines of investigation, has sent out thousands of graduates to leaven the mass of Funda-

mentalist and Ku Klux ignorance and intolerance rampant in its fertile valleys. Yet it is probable that a popular vote on the question—which will sooner or later be taken—would outlaw the teaching of evolution even in that forward-looking state. Some college professors have recently expressed this view in answer to my inquiries.

It is gratifying to note that the Oregon Methodist Conference of 1926 gave no encouragement to those ministers who devote a great part of their time and energy to "exposing" the "modern baptized infidels in Methodist pulpits," Modernist "infidels who are preaching things Ingersoll would be ashamed of." One swashbuckler of the old school, the Rev. Guy Fitch Phelps, who stands "just where Wesley, Fletcher Coke, Asbury, Lee, and Simpson" stood, priding himself on not having learned anything during the past half century of advancing scholarship, found himself quite out of touch with Oregon leaders of Methodism. A motion was made and seconded that this doughty foe of "evolution and the infidels who are denying the Virgin Birth" be "located"—i. e., retired.

"Mr. [W. S.] Gordon would not have moved my location," says Mr. Phelps (in a letter of protest to Bishop William O. Shepard and the members of the Conference, dated July 30, 1926), "had I been one of their breed and brood of preacher crooks who are selling Methodism to the Devil in these days of Darwinism and the vagaries of 'modern scholarship.' "

He finds it amusing

"to hear these pseudo-scientists mouthing of scholarship when they do not know the difference between evolution and

development. Let us know them for what they are, ignorant, conceited, illogical betrayers of the great church of Wesley. . . . It is this horde of infidels, made such by the improved theory of evolution, who have killed revivals in Methodism" [of the Phelps school].

Meanwhile, "this gang of evolutionary infidels," unlike the "located" Mr. Phelps, may have been reading Wesley's "Compendium of Natural Philosophy, Containing an Abridgment of that Beautiful Work, 'The Contemplation of Nature,' by Mr. Bonnet of Geneva" (New York, 1923). "Mr. Bonnet" happened to be one of the very few naturalists of his day (1720–1793) who believed in evolution (though not in the Darwinian sense), and Wesley (1703–1791) was virtually the only clergyman in the world who approved of the doctrine taught by Bonnet, translating for his students in Methodism 150 pages of Bonnet's work on evolution!

The learned Mr. Phelps was, not long ago, giving a course of lectures designed to show why the teaching of evolution should be barred from the schools of Oregon and Washington. Two evenings of his course were given to the subject, "The Absurdities of Evolution," and a third to "Evolution Exposed." In Washington he was frequently assisted by the Rev. Mark A. Matthews, the Dr. Straton of Seattle, and a member of the inner council of the Bible Crusaders.

The "pickings" evidently not being very good in the anti-evolution lecture field—working as a free-lance champion of Babylonian and Persian science—the devout Mr. Phelps has recently begun the organization of what he is pleased to call "The Fundamentalist Feder-

ation"—an inter-denominational body—with headquarters in Portland, Oregon.

"This organization was formed to unite all Christian people in a SOLID FRONT against the ecclesiastical and academic infidelity which is sworn to destroy the Christian religion ROOT and BRANCH."

By "the Christian religion" Mr. Phelps means the theological conceptions of the Dark Ages. He announces that:

"The hour has come to launch OUR paper, *The Western Fundamentalist.* It will be THE GREAT VOICE OF THE NORTHWEST raised against the FLOODS OF ECCLESIASTICAL AND ACADEMIC INFIDELITY WHICH ARE SINKING THE CHURCHES. Everything is ready"—but the subscriptions. . . .

"The situation is ghastly! . . . EVOLUTION, which is responsible for the situation, is RAMPANT. Our young people are being made into ATHEISTS in armies. The PROFESSORS BOAST of it. The situation is SIMPLY APPALLING BEYOND BELIEF."

It is not difficult to "locate" the Rev. Guy Fitch Phelps!

WASHINGTON

The Rev. L. R. Butcher, a Baptist minister of Bellingham, who is secretary of the State Bible and Science [!] League, recently announced that a fight against the teaching of evolution in the public schools and colleges of Washington would be launched immediately. The attacks are to begin with the election of school boards. All

candidates for local school boards are henceforth to be closely questioned as to their views on the formation of the earth's first woman from a rib of Adam, the unfathered father of the human race. Any candidate who entertains any doubt about Eve's having been so manufactured will be vigorously opposed.

While a great deal of quiet propaganda against the theory of an orderly operation of nature's laws has been carried on in Washington during the past three years or more, the Evergreen State has not figured very much in the news regarding the war on science and scientific method; nevertheless, the foes of learning have by no means neglected their duty, and considerable prejudice against modern science in relation to the theory of evolution has already been created by the traditionalists.

An article which appeared in *The Republic*, a Yakima daily, states that:

> "The nearest word to 'evolution' in the biology text-books used by high school teachers is 'evaporation.' Not once does the word 'evolution' occur in the index or contents of the book, Smallwood, Reveley and Bailey's 'Biology for High Schools,' published in 1920. It is now being replaced by 'New Biology,' a book by the same authors, which is said to be more bold in the matter.
>
> "Reference books containing some lights on the theory of evolution have been available in the school library, but among these books has not been Charles Darwin's 'Origin of Species.' . . . Perhaps the most radical book on the subject anywhere in the high school is the Encyclopaedia Britannica. Nor is the city library well supplied with the source books of the evolutionary theory."

Some abstracts from a letter to the same daily, by the botanist, Dr. Ira D. Cardiff, will throw additional light

on the progress of Fundamentalist influence in this thriving city of eastern Washington:

"It is probably the opinion of ninety-five per cent. of the scientists and scholars of the world that Darwin is the foremost of all scientists, and that his work has completely revolutionized human thinking, yet the Yakima High School library does not contain a copy of his celebrated work and the head of the science department is alleged to have stated that Man's development can be taught without mention of this great scientist—not because the head of the science department doesn't recognize the transcendent position of Darwin in the educational world, for she probably does, but she probably takes this position out of fear of the bigotry and intolerance of a minority group in the community, who undertake to say the entire community shall conform to its beliefs and further would undertake to punish anyone who did not so conform.

"It is stated that the teacher in biology has handed in his outline of work with no reference to evolution contained therein. The evolution concept is undoubtedly the greatest generalization the human mind has ever made, and it is a sad commentary upon the intolerance of any group of people when our public school teachers' minds are so poisoned with fear that matters of such import cannot even be presented to our students."

Fundamentalist interference with the school system of this country was condemned by Dr. Henry Suzzallo, until recently president of the University of Washington, in an address, at Spokane, before the State Press Association:

"A dangerous tendency in America is that of meddling. You shouldn't do a thing simply because you have the power. It is wrong to perform a surgical operation without technical

training. . . . It is wrong to take educational prerogatives out of the hands of educational experts.

"I don't know what we can do in our public school system unless we teach the truth. A majority never determines the truth, nor does a minority. Truth is determined by scientific means. If something can be proved by scientific means the schools should be allowed to teach it. Facts are not a dangerous thing in a democracy. . . .

"Legislation concerning what shall be taught brings about propaganda, legal or illegal. Propaganda emphasizes the truth favorable to a particular cause and is emotional. Education emphasizes all truth as a question, good or bad, and allows the student to draw his own conclusions. It is intellectual. Propaganda is never education."

Besides the inspiring work done by Prof. Trevor Kincaid and his able colleagues of the University of Washington (Seattle), valuable instruction in evolution is being given at Whitman College, in eastern Washington (Walla Walla), in three courses, as follows:

"Evolution. A study of variation and the factors in organic evolution. Reading, discussions and reports.

"Heredity and Environment. A study of recent investigations in the field of heredity with special reference to human development and social improvement. Reading, discussions and reports.

"Biology and Present Day Problems. A discussion of the biological aspect of social problems. Reading, discussions and reports."

To abrogate by law the right of teachers of science to give instruction to the youth of Washington in such subjects would be nothing short of a social crime. As Prof. William M. Goldsmith truly says:

"It should be evident even to the most radical anti-evolutionist that evolutionary teachings are linked up with various sub-

jects—subjects which indeed are the basis for plant, animal, and human improvement. This situation makes it impossible to discontinue the teaching of evolution without an entire revision of human knowledge."

And Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt is wholly right in declaring that:

"No text-book in any department of science which omits or evades evolution can receive the honest endorsement of any scientist or any teacher educated in science."

But Washington, like Oregon and California, has the initiative and referendum system; and Dr. William B. Riley has stated that anti-evolution organizations are being formed in these states, preparatory to the outlawing of evolution from their educational system. It is not possible at this time to say just how large a percentage of the voters would support an anti-evolution measure. As elsewhere, the Lutherans, Adventists, Bible Students, most of the Methodists and Baptists, and a large proportion of the Presbyterians and Roman Catholics, would vote for the abolition of evolutionary teaching. Concerning the Baptists of Washington, the following Associated Press dispatch, dated from Seattle, June 24, 1925, speaks for itself:

"More than 2,800 out of an audience of 3,000 upheld arguments of Dr. W. B. Riley of Minneapolis for a literal interpretation of the creation as told in Genesis, as opposed to the theory of evolution, presented by Edward A. Cantrell of Los Angeles in a debate here to-night. The debate was held under the auspices of the Baptist Bible Union of North America, in convention here.

" 'There is not a scintilla of scientific evidence in support of

the theory of evolution,' Dr. Riley contended. 'Possibly the Darwinians have vestigial remains in their bodies, but I want to say right now that I have none in mine. I believe that my tonsils and my appendix were put into my body for some purpose.' "

This sort of "argument" by Dr. Riley was greeted by the audience with cheers, as it was in other debates held with him by Mr. Cantrell in Washington and Oregon, and by me in California.

In eastern Washington, the chief spokesman for Babylonian-Hebrew mythology is the Rev. Dr. John D. Reid, a Fundamentalist clergyman of Spokane, and a contributing editor to Mr. Washburn's *Crusader*. In a recent letter to a student in a state institution who, Reid stated, objected to hearing anti-Genesaic geology and anthropology in his science classes, and to being obliged to study text-books which shamelessly advocate the theory of evolution, Dr. Reid said, among other things:

"I deem it of the utmost importance that you have a clear understanding—free from all confusing side-issues—of the real reasons why the Crusaders and others so strenuously oppose the teaching in tax-supported schools of evolution—or, with greater precision, of the evolutionary hypotheses—any of them—whether of Darwin, Lamarck, De Vries, or any other. Here are five:

"First, because that which is being taught in 'science classes' is not 'science'—i. e., classified and co-ordinated knowledge, based upon verifiable and verified facts; but a tentative hypothesis as yet unproven. Later it may be shown to have a solid basis in verified and indisputable facts. When that has been done, we shall most cordially wish it 'God-speed' [?]. Till then we object to being forced to pay our good money to teachers to stuff our children with 'wild speculations,' which grow wilder every day, with what one noted professor [?]

denominates 'pure figments of the imagination.' We wish them to be taught facts, not fancies, nor conjectures ('we may well suppose'), inferences, and haphazard guesses. [The cautious attitude of scientists is constantly being ridiculed by Fundamentalists.]

"Second, because, contrary to fact, reason and common sense, evolution—including that of man from the lower animals—is taught to be 'a continuous, progressive change from lower to higher, from simple to more complex forms as the result of the operation of resident forces acting in accordance with certain fixed laws' (Le Conte). In other words, as the undirected, uncontrolled operation of blind unintelligent 'force,' or 'forces,' precluding and denying the intervention of any outside force or forces, and thus eliminating the supernatural altogether. It is a philosophy of pure naturalism; and while not all evolutionists go as far as this, the leading, the real exponents of organic evolution pride themselves upon having evolved a system which has neither need nor place for God, whether as Creator, Preserver, Director, or Governor of what they call 'nature.'

"Third, because . . . if, in deference to Jewish, or Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, the Bible is to be kept out of our schools, because of alleged infringement upon their distinctive and cherished beliefs, we insist that anti-Biblical, materialistic, naturalistic philosophy shall also be 'kept out.' Our public schools must be kept non-sectarian. Evolution, as it is taught, is sectarian, inasmuch as it openly assails not only 'The Holy Bible, God's inestimable gift to man,' but some of the most cherished beliefs of a very large proportion of those whose taxes support these institutions and pay these teachers.

"Fourth, because evolution as it is taught, involving the genetic ascent of man from the lower animals—from brutes—yes, even lower, from loathsome reptiles and even from slime, inculcates and fosters a philosophy of life, which if unchecked, will in another generation be the ruin of our nation! It undermines all moral responsibility as it recognizes no accountability to anyone or anything beyond our own 'natural instincts.' These being inherited from lower animals, brutish,

animal expressions thereof in conduct, however much they may be deplored, cannot with justice be condemned. . . .

"Fifth, if any further reason is needed—because it is stuffing our children and youth, at their most impressionable age, with the utmost nonsense, fairy tales against which, when stripped of their high-sounding 'scientific' verbiage, the plain common sense of men and women of average intelligence revolts. Much of it is amusing. More of it is disgusting! . . .

"Does anyone longer wonder at our unalterable determination that 'Evolution (as it is being taught) shall be kept *out* of our Public Schools'? "

Early in 1927 Mr. Guy Fitch Phelps held a convention of his Fundamentalists' Federation in Spokane, and announced the launching of a campaign against the teaching of evolution in Washington. Thus far no legislative action has been taken.

HAWAII

The attempt to transform the secular government of the United States into a Fundamentalist theocracy is not only nation-wide, but extends even to our insular possessions. Under the direction of one Eugene Arnett, an organization was recently being formed in the Hawaiian Islands having for objective the conversion of the secular constitution into a "Christian Constitution." Mr. Arnett is a resident of Oklahoma, but seems to have started to convert Hawaii first. A doctor in Molokai received a communication reading as follows:

"Nearly ninety per cent. of the good 'leaders' who have had an OPPORTUNITY, have signed the enclosed designed to separate the sound from the unsound. To insure consideration sign and return by first mail with whatever constructive criti-

cism may occur to you. Before printing 1,000,000 we want your opinion."

The enclosure read:

"The Creed of Christian Citizenship

"I. I believe in Christian character—founded on a fundamental faith (1) in the Creator of natural law (2) in the Christ (3) in the Bible conception of immortality.

"II. I believe in the Christian conscience—the sustaining line of defense against the dastardly deception made perfectly plain through the obvious objectives of Marxian Materialism [*sic*].

"III. I believe in the Christian Constitution—the fundamental principles of constitutional government upon which this Republic was founded; and in support thereof I hereby pledge my life, my fortune, and my sacred honor."

To which the doctor very aptly replied:

"I could not subscribe to your creed until I know your definition of Christian character, conscience, and 'fundamental faith and principles.' If your definition is in accord with that of Mr. Bryan, or those of other anti-evolution agitators, I should have to record my decided dissent."

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The long arm of Fundamentalism has now reached across the Pacific and is grasping for control of the little red schoolhouse in the Philippine Islands.

On July 26, 1926, Pastor B. Noel, Representative of the Sixth District of Cebu, introduced a bill in the Legislature with the following explanatory note:

"The aim of this bill is to discontinue and prohibit the teach-

ing of the evolution theory in the public schools of the Philippines.

"The Filipino people are Christian and firmly believe in the story of the origin of man as narrated in the Holy Scriptures. The theory of evolution violently opposes and denies their fundamental belief. Therefore, to teach it in schools supported by the money of the people who repudiate it, is unwise, futile and preposterous. It means the teaching of the theory to the children of people who disbelieve it. It means the wasting of their money. This is unfair, unjust, undemocratic and, consequently, unjustifiable."

The Act, known as House Bill No. 780, is as follows:

"An Act prohibiting the teaching of the evolution theory in all schools of the Philippine Islands, which are supported in whole or in part by the public school funds of the Philippine Government, and to provide penalties for the violation thereof.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Philippines in Legislature assembled and by the authority of the same:

"Section 1. It shall be unlawful for any teacher in any of the universities, normal schools, high schools, and all other public schools of the Philippine Islands, which are supported in whole or in part by the public school funds of the Philippine Government, to teach any theory that denies the story of the divine creation of man as taught in the Holy Scriptures, and to teach instead that man has descended from a lower order of animals.

"Section 2. Any teacher found guilty of the violation of this Act shall be punished by a fine of not less than fifty pesos nor more than five hundred pesos and shall be removed from the service.

"Section 3. Any Acts or parts of Acts inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed.

"Section 4. This Act shall take effect on and from May first, nineteen hundred and twenty-seven."

The report of the committee to which the bill was referred—if any report was made—has not been made public. C. H. McClure, of Dagupan, Pangasinan, to whom I am indebted for a copy of the bill, says: "Our newspapers were evidently afraid to comment on the anti-evolution bill." He adds that he understands the bill was killed in committee.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

During the trial of Scopes it was generally assumed by the country at large that the enactment of the Tennessee anti-evolution law was to be accounted for by the backward condition of large sections of the commonwealth, where the percentage of illiteracy runs very high. As a matter of fact, the Legislature of the Volunteer State does not differ greatly in intellectual status from those of many of the other States, or even from that of the Congress at Washington. The Senate and the House of Representatives of the national capital are made up largely of members from Fundamentalist sections who could not have been elected had they not been at least nominal communicants of some Fundamentalist church.

Early in 1925 the Board of Temperance, Prohibition and Public Morals of the Methodist Episcopal Church published a survey of Congress, which showed that of 435 members of the House, 90 were Methodists, 63 Presbyterians, 48 Baptists, and 21 Disciples of Christ (Campbellites or "Christians")—"all sects which, while including liberal and Modernist elements, are largely Fundamentalist." A similar proportion was maintained in the Senate. Only thirty-five Representatives and ten

Senators announced themselves as without church affiliation.

We need not, therefore, be surprised to learn that the Congress of the United States enacted a law in the spring of 1924 which virtually abolished the right of teachers in the District of Columbia (which is entirely under control of the Federal Government) to teach evolution. "Evolution" was not, to be sure, mentioned in the bill; but then neither does the word occur in the text of the Tennessee law. It is not, however, to be understood that a majority of our national lawmakers voted deliberately to outlaw the teaching of evolution in the District of Columbia. That may come later, as the result of further Fundamentalist propaganda and political organization in the various states.

But it is by no means necessary to obtain the vote of a majority of Senators and Representatives in order to put a measure over in the Congress. Bills are often passed by the consent of *the members present.* And so it was in the case of the bill under notice. No members other than those actually concerned with its enactment knew that it was to be considered and voted upon. When Summers' amendment, to be discussed later, was read, only twenty to thirty representatives were present out of 435. Representative Blanton then called for a quorum, and 233 members entered and responded to roll-call, evidently thinking they were merely voting on the usual routine appropriation bill. This is how the (implicitly) anti-evolution amendment was "put over":

Every year, a vote on the annual appropriation bill for the District of Columbia for the period following is taken as part of the mere routine business of the Con-

gress. Many of our solons are absent when this business comes before the House. When the appropriation bill for 1925 came up for discussion in the House of Representatives, on May 3, 1924, it contained a rider which had been very quietly inserted by the Fundamentalist Representative from Walla Walla, Washington, John W. Summers. This un-American rider provided—apparently innocently enough—that:

"No part of the sum [appropriated for the District of Columbia in general] shall be available for the payment of the salary of any educational director who permits the teaching of partisan politics, *disrespect of the Holy Bible,* or that ours is an inferior form of government."

This law was advocated by the Fundamentalist Representative from Texas, Thomas L. Blanton and, after some discussion, was concurred in by Rep. Tom Connaly, of the same state.

Among Fundamentalists the teaching of evolution is considered equivalent to asserting that the Bible stories of the Creation and Fall of Man are "lies," and therefore disrespectful to the Holy Bible, as in the Tennessee and Mississippi enactments. *The Outlook* did not fail to note this implication. To quote a paragraph in point from this periodical:

"Both of these laws [Tennessee and the District of Columbia] are anti-evolution laws in the minds of the anti-evolutionists, who are responsible for them. The Tennessee law prohibits the teaching in schools supported by state appropriations of any theory which contradicts 'the divine story of creation as told in the Bible.' In the judgment of anti-evolutionists, the thing prohibited is the theory of evolution. The Federal law prohibits the payment of salaries from public appropriations

to school officials who permit to be taught 'disrespect of the Bible.' In the judgment of the anti-evolutionists, the thing prohibited is the theory of evolution."

While the full significance of the phrase "disrespect of the Holy Bible" seems to have escaped the attention of at least some of the lawmakers in the House, it did not fail to evoke the resentment of Loren H. Wittner, a clerk in the treasury department. Mr. Wittner has long been known as a vigorous opponent of all legislation that tends to or actually does encroach upon the First Amendment to the Constitution; he takes the American principle of complete separation of Church and State literally. So on July 22, 1925, he asked the District Supreme Court to enjoin the city's fiscal agents from paying salaries to instructors who taught the evolutionary theory of the origin of man in conflict with divine creation, thus preparing a test case.

In his bill of complaint, Mr. Wittner cited thirteen specific instances of "disrespect for the Bible" through teaching from the approved text-books in natural sciences. One of the books cited was Hunter's "Civic Biology," which we have met before in Tennessee and elsewhere. The defendants were Daniel Donovan, auditor; J. R. Lusby, disbursing officer; Frank White, Treasurer of the United States; Frank W. Ballou, Superintendent of Schools; and W. P. Hay, head of the department of biology and chemistry.

In the thirteen stipulations the petition gave facts taught by evolutionists which flatly denied the truth of Biblical teachings. Science, the petition stated, denies that man was made in the physical image of God, out of the dust of the ground, and that woman was made from

one of the ribs of man. It teaches instead that "man has evolved through millions of years from a single protoplasmic cell." It teaches that man is ever evolving, whereas the Bible says that man was made perfect "and later fell because the first woman, his wife, believed what the snake said to her about eating the forbidden fruit."

The petition went on to allege similar contradictions in astronomy, physics, chemistry, geology, biology, and even philology, which last-named science teaches that:

"Language and speech are the gradual outgrowth and unfoldment of thought brought about by the evolution of man, whereas the Bible teaches that the earth had one language and one speech until men decided to build a Tower of Babel, which would reach up to heaven, when God came down and suddenly confounded their speech so that no one could understand them."

Continuation of such instruction, out of the funds collected as taxes, would, said the petition, "work irreparable damage and loss to the plaintiff and to all of the taxpayers of the District and of the United States."

When informed in Dayton (July 22nd) that a suit had been filed in Washington to enjoin the payment of salaries to directors of education there, Bryan said:

"So it has broken out in Washington, has it? Well, when the people get awakened and find out how this stealthy conspiracy against the religion of the Bible has spread throughout the country, there is no telling how many suits will be brought. The Atheists, parading under the banner of freedom of speech and freedom of conscience, will have to unmask and do their work in the open from now on. They will find it a different proposition to the secret manipulations [!]

which they [meaning the evolutionists, whom he characterized elsewhere as "dishonest scoundrels, afraid to tell their beliefs —burrowing in the ground and stealing away the faith of the children"] have employed in their efforts to force unbelief upon children in the schools."

Apparently it did not occur to the Colonel that his own habit of misrepresenting scientists and the teachings of evolution, to say nothing of his false teachings concerning the Bible, could be continued only under that same "banner of freedom of speech and freedom of conscience" recognized as necessary to progress by "the atheistic evolutionists."

Prof. W. P. Hay, named as one of the defendants in Wittner's test suit, said:

"We teach evolution in Washington high schools. We make no effort to affect the belief of the pupils, however. In my own classes, the question of belief comes up usually every year. Generally the pupils bring it up by asking me if I believe in evolution. I tell them that I do, and explain the theory without bias in either direction."

Dr. Frank W. Ballou, Superintendent of Schools, remarked that evolution was taught in Washington schools "as a theory," and aside from all questions of religious faith.

"Practically all text-books on evolution," said Dr. Ballou, "accept the theory of evolution, but a text-book is only an instrument. *It rests with the teacher as to how much of the theory he will teach or whether he will teach it at all.* We do not question a teacher in examining him whether he believes in evolution or not. If a teacher is questioned on evolution it is in order to ascertain how much he knows of the subject. The Board of Education does not consider the teaching of evo-

lution as disrespectful to the Bible. The text-books on evolution, approved by the board, are not chosen because they teach evolution, but because they are the best text-books available on their subjects."

Having accomplished his chief purpose, that of focusing the attention of the more enlightened public on this stealthy attempt to fasten on the state the duty of upholding by law the sanctity of a collection of ancient sacred writings have no validity as science, Mr. Wittner withdrew hls case.

When the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia again came before the House of Representatives on March 19, 1926, Rep. Bill G. Lowrey of Mississippi was at once on his feet as protagonist of an amendment similar to the one juggled through without debate or consideration in the previous session of Congress. The amendment this time would have provided for the withholding of the salary of *any teacher* who should have shown disrespect to the Bible, advocated partisan politics, or taught that "ours is an inferior form of government." In this instance the House was thoroughly awake. Chairman Martin B. Madden of the Appropriations Committee (Representative from Illinois) raised the point of order against Lowrey's proposed amendment. Rep. Frederick R. Lehlbach, of New Jersey, temporarily in the chair, ruled the amendment out of order because it was new legislation which would place upon the District of Columbia disburser the duty of interpreting "three great generalizations" subject to widely varying views. As might be expected, Fundamentalist Blanton of Texas (who once got into trouble by using obscene language on the floor of the House) appealed from the decision of the

chair. By a vote of 48 to 2 the ruling was sustained, and Fundamentalism was defeated in the House—for the time being.

Commenting on this episode, *The Brooklyn Daily Eagle* remarked:

> "States with a low standard of literacy are stronger than they ought to be in the House of Representatives, but they are still in a hopeless minority."

From present indications, the "minority" will not be nearly so hopeless in the not distant future; for it will very probably be lamentably demonstrated that representatives from states not having "a low standard of literacy" can be duly elected and seated on the basis of a belief that this nation was "founded on the Bible," with all that this erroneous notion implies—including the doctrine that the Bible is above criticism.

Not content with their attempt to control the curricula of our schools and colleges in the interest of their sectarian views, the Fundamentalists have begun also an attack upon various governmental scientific bureaus, including the United States Geological Survey. As their leading "scientific" spokesman, George McCready Price, says ("Science and Religion in a Nutshell," page 21):

> "For two generations or more the governments of all civilized countries have had large numbers of highly trained men organized into what are termed Geological Survey staffs. These men are employed at government expense to study the rocks in various parts of the country, and the results of their studies are published at government expense in the form of 'Reports.' . . . These government reports have for all these years been equivalent to a wholesale official propaganda in favor of the evolution theory [instead of the Book of Genesis], carried on

at government expense by the official and highly respected and well-salaried representatives of practically all the governments on earth."

The conclusion drawn by the celebrated Bible-geologist is that such institutions should be abolished, supported as they are by "Christian taxpayers." He warns his fellow-Fundamentalists of the danger to "Christianity" (Fundamentalist variety) of such "atheistic" reports. Says he (page 12):

"When this idea of long ages of time during which the world was developing was first put forward, not many people saw its true import. But now that this theory has been before the world for nearly a century, and as it has had a full opportunity to develop and show its real meaning, we begin to see that it is really one of the worst and most anti-Christian theories ever foisted upon a credulous world. For not only does this idea throw discredit upon the whole Scriptural record of the beginnings of our world [and thus show "disrespect for the Bible"]; we now see that through its modern developments it strikes also at every fundamental doctrine of historic Christianity. We see that when the basic idea of Creation [as recorded in Genesis] is removed or discredited, the whole structure of revealed religion is vitally endangered."

Fundamentalist evangelists are also making attacks upon the Bureau of American Ethnology and the Natural History Museums in Washington and elsewhere. Modernist clergymen who rise to defend the methods of science as against the methods of the traditionalists are regarded as traitors and betrayers of "the word of God."

At the Northern Baptist Convention held in Washington, May 28, 1926, this "middle of the road" element was attacked by the Baptist Bible Union and the Baptist

Publication Society, ultra-Fundamentalist organizations, as designing to protect the Modernist movement and the evolutionists. The reactionaries then drafted an opposition slate "to keep the church safe for Genesis." The Fundamentalist members of the Bible Union also adopted a resolution calling upon the convention and the Baptists of the country generally to remove Modernists from the mission field and from educational institutions; and the speakers said there would be no let-up in the fight within the church against Modernists, who were characterized as "cuckoos who have taken the nests of others."

It remains to record that an attempt was made (July 6, 1926) by Fundamentalist Senator Cole Blease of South Carolina, to amend the Dill radio bill in such a way as to make it illegal to broadcast any matter favorable to the theory of evolution. The attempt gave rise to a dispute between Senator Blease and Senator Royal Copeland of New York, who is a physician.

"I want to get the Senate on record," Blease said. "I am willing to testify that I am on the side of Jesus Christ." "I am a religious man and I believe in evolution too," replied Dr. Copeland.

Finally the bill was passed without the obnoxious clause; in fact, it provided as passed that if one side of a disputed subject is broadcast the other shall be given an opportunity to be heard also, and that neither the government nor the station licensed shall have the right to censor anything but obscene language. Nevertheless, censorship is being practised by broadcasting stations throughout the country now; and it is doubtful if the Dill Bill will effect any real change for the better. There

are numerous powerful stations erected for the express purpose of broadcasting propaganda for Fundamentalism and against evolution, such as the typical one at Angelus Temple, Los Angeles; whereas there are not many stations where scientists or Modernists can "get on the air" for even brief periods to defend evolution. *The Forum,* which had been broadcasting a series of debates, was refused permission to give a debate between Bryan and Osborn on evolution, on the ground that it was "a controversial subject." However, the Dill law may possibly tend to make some cases of unfair discrimination less frequent and less flagrantly in violation of the principles of true Americanism.

Commenting on Bryan's speeches in Tennessee in which he stated that he would, if necessary, attempt so to amend the Constitution of the United States as virtually to nullify those provisions which insure religious and educational liberty, *The San Francisco Bulletin* said editorially (July 10, 1925):

"Evidently this is no idle vaporing. Mr. Bryan is perfectly logical. Bigotry is always logical. It reasons in a rigidly logical order, with which order the mind can find no fault, from what it supposes to be an underlying truth, to a conclusion that would be true if the supposed truth were true. Mr. Bryan believes that the theory of evolution is hostile to the Christian faith. Believing that, how can he tolerate something whose general acceptance would deprive mankind of the hope and consolations of Christianity?

"Sad to say, there is in this attitude nothing new, nor peculiar to Mr. Bryan. Primitive peoples have killed their kings and tortured innocent victims at the stake because of a belief that they had done something or discovered something or said something to interfere with the rainfall, or the pollination of the corn. That was logical, because they supposed that rain

or pollination could be hindered that way. In fact, a rigid adherence to logic is the hall-mark of the primitive mind, and leads to just such results. The less men know the more logical they are, and, as Clarence Darrow says, the less they doubt. Mr. Bryan has no doubts at all.

"Moreover, he supposes widespread evils can be corrected by passing laws. That, too, is primitive. . . . And large masses of the people are as logical as Mr. Bryan and believe as he believes. It has been proved dangerously easy to amend the Constitution. Darrow says of this general matter: 'Ultimately the people can do anything they want to. All that is needed here is a sufficient number of people wrong at the same time and in the same way, who are sure they are right.'

"It is well to know the probable object of Mr. Bryan's next crusade, and not to underestimate the chances of its success. That object will be to make the teaching of science in the schools unconstitutional, and put the science teacher in the same class with the bootlegger."

It is quite certain, as the facts given in this book show fully, that Bryan's successors are attempting to carry out their former leader's aims. "If we are not vigilant on behalf of intellectual liberty it might happen."

An amendment to the Federal Constitution outlawing the teaching of evolution seems, on the face of it, to be a remote contingency; but the danger is ever present. As Arthur Brisbane has remarked:

"The country has acquired the habit of amending the Constitution, and it will do almost anything to oblige a band of enthusiastic and determined agitators. They need not be anything like a majority, for, as one of our college presidents told us the other day, indifference is the prevailing attitude. If eighty persons are indifferent and twenty persons are inspired with the proper degree of zeal the minority will rule. Of course there was a time when indifference was unknown and it took a

majority to make a law. But those were old-fashioned days; things are different now."

The Rev. John Emerson Roberts, lecturer of the Church of This World, Kansas City, Missouri, does not in the least exaggerate the present peril to our modern civilization in saying:

"Money is being raised to support a lobby in Washington to work for anti-evolution legislation in the approaching Congress.

"Thousands of reputable American citizens, and thousands more of religious morons and fanatics, are right now enlisted, body, soul, and pocketbook, to spread darkness over the land.

"Superstition is wreathed in smiles while Progress is bathed in tears. Intolerance is raising its ugly head and Persecution is furtively gathering fagots.

"All this is being done while Liberals, comfortable and content in their fancied security, lift no hand to protect their liberties—raise no cry of alarm at the inroads of militant ignorance, pay no heed to the audacious demands of religious tyranny, but slumber peacefully on while religious zealots barricade the road of progress, put out the eyes of intelligence, mutilate learning, and nail reason to the cross."

CHAPTER IX

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

IT is, of course, useless to point out dangers without suggesting some method or methods through which they may be removed or averted. We have seen that millions of misguided voters are committed to the doctrine that the teaching of evolution in the educational institutions of this country is a menace to their version of Christianity.

According to the annual census of *The Christian Herald*, the church membership of the United States at the close of 1925 was 46,883,756—a gain of 807,256 over 1924. Now, while no one could state with accuracy just what proportion of these communicants is opposed to freedom of teaching, he would be an optimist indeed who would place the number of anti-evolutionists—actual and potential—at fewer than 25,000,000.

And these 25,000,000 or more "true believers" in Genesis as containing, literally, an infallible account of "Creation," inspired by the Creator Himself, *are organized;* not, to be sure, all organized as anti-evolutionists, but all organized as believers in the inerrancy of the Bible. Naturally, they will vote as they believe.

These millions of Fundamentalist voters may be counted upon, if not to-day, then in the immediate future, to support only such candidates for public office as

will give pre-election assurances of being opposed to "the pagan doctrine" that "man came from a lower order of animals." During one of his debates with me, Dr. W. B. Riley declared: "Within five years, not an educator in America will *dare* to look you in the eyes and say that he believes in evolution." A gross exaggeration, of course; but, as we have seen, teachers in many states of the Union are already dropping the term from their class-room vocabulary, just as it is being eliminated from the nation's high school text-books, either by legislation or by state boards of education. In many school districts, where evolution has not as yet been eliminated from the text-books, certain chapters are simply ignored by the teacher, and with the full approval of the local school board. In many other districts, the groups who believe with the late Mr. Bryan that evolution "makes the Bible a lie and Christ and impostor" are organizing politically for the purpose of nominating and electing school trustees who will be pledged in advance to prohibit the teaching of "this pagan doctrine" in the schools under their control.

What should or can we do about it?

Obviously, we should *meet organization with organization.* As individuals we are helpless. As members of a nation-wide organization devoted exclusively to the protection of our schools, colleges and universities from the onslaughts of fanaticism, and to the preservation thereby of the good old American principle of complete separation of Church and State, we could render the forces of darkness and reaction impotent, and common sense would eventually triumph over obscurantism.

Unfortunately, at the present time, meeting organiza-

tion with organization is a doubly difficult task. For freedom in research and teaching is insecure not only as the result of the organized attacks of the Fundamentalists, but also, one regrets to find, as the result of indifference or apathy on the part of many educated citizens who accept the theory of evolution as valid. This state of mind is all too frequently justified by a peculiar form of rationalization. A letter from a learned and widely known physician in a southern state illustrates this dangerous attitude.

"I feel," he writes, "that those phases of science that touch upon all the things that pertain to the welfare of the race, uneducated and intellectual alike, are of more concern than the acceptance of the fact of evolution by students. . . . I am not an advocate of too wide a dissemination of the superficialities of knowledge. Why, indeed, should all public school children be taught biology? They will acquire little, if any, worth-while knowledge and retain less. Could not this time and effort be more wisely devoted to business methods, business ethics, or some useful art or trade?"

But this line of argument ignores the cardinal fact that we owe it to the rising generation precisely that it shall not be handicapped by the educational and intellectual limitations which made the parents, in many cases, victims of the restricted opportunities of their own youth. By giving to as many as possible of our young people —to all of them, in any event, who attain the high school —at least an opportunity to learn what has been discovered during the past half century, and what is being thought to-day by the best educated persons in our modern world, we at least do all in our power to "raise the intellectual index of the people."

"Fundamentalism," the doctor goes on, "left to itself, will do no harm. Let it run riot; let it go to seed." This also is a very popular argument. It may be heard almost daily.

The trouble is that its proponents forget that every adult citizen of this country has a vote. The "x" of an illiterate backwoodsman can cancel that of a David Starr Jordan. But illiteracy by no means necessarily argues unintelligence; it is the half-literate, the people who can read but not think, who constitute the great menace to progress. And they, with their millions of organized votes, can wipe out the few feeble ballots of the scientists and the friends of science—if the friends of science remain unorganized to resist them.

With Fundamentalism, as it affects certain religious dogmas, no one outside of the creeds concerned need have any quarrel. It is when—as is universally the case—the embattled Fundamentalists place themselves in the vanguard as the enemies of modern evolutionary thought that those who understand the painful labors which have built up the body of science must range themselves in defense of what has been so hardly won. If this sinister movement be allowed to "run riot," there will be no end to its aggression. And yet there are many who feel that to balk the anti-evolutionists:

> "would only repel [them] and perhaps raise an antagonism that would cause people to rise up against all science, and to destroy those phases that pertain to the welfare of the race in general."

That antagonism does not need to be raised; it already exists. Behind the hollow statements of anti-evolution

orators that they love "true science," and object only to "science falsely so called"; behind the specious attempts to revive the obsolete conclusions of long-dead scientists and to distort out of their context the statements of living ones; behind all this is the very real resentment of the uncultured toward what the late Mr. Bryan used to designate contemptuously as "the cultured crowd." This resentment is powerful and dangerous because it is rooted in emotion. It arises from the inferiority complex which orthodox belief soothes and contemporary science explains. That is why the most ignorant are always the hottest in their defense of their primitive faith, and why the war on evolution has elicited from its soldiers and generals language so intemperate as to sound incredible to those not used to it.

Flushed by each new victory, this mass of emotionalized opinion will go ever farther and farther—has been and is now doing so;—until at last perhaps not even our vaunted applied science (the ultimate source of America's wealth and power) may go by the board. To be sure, radios and aeroplanes are now put to the service of mediaeval theology. But this may not be so forever; let us remember the smashed machines of Samuel Butler's "Erewhon." Applied science derives from pure science; if you kill the root, the tree will die.

Suppose Democritus, Socrates, Epicurus, Lucretius, Copernicus, Descartes, Galileo, Hobbes, Gassendi, Bruno, Newton, Voltaire, Lamarck, Darwin, had all taken the position that their views would only "raise an antagonism that would cause people to rise up against all science," where would science be to-day? Any person who has, in any age, combated superstition and en-

trenched ignorance, who has opposed infantile phantasy and fearlessly faced reality, has been denounced as a destroyer of faith, a menace to public morals, and, in many cases, an emissary of His Satanic Majesty.

"Why, indeed, should all public school children be taught biology?" Not alone because we owe the best we have to "all the children of all the people"; not alone because all these children will some day be voters who can decide whether biology (which to-day involves the theory of evolution) shall be taught in twentieth century America; but above all because modern biology is an essential part of modern education, touching upon every phase of modern life, even personal hygiene and public health.

At almost every election in California (which is one of the states having the initiative system), bills appear on the ballot, for direct vote of all the people, which immediately affect the future of medical research, and hence of public health, in that state. What is the genesis of all these bills, many of which if carried would end the tremendously valuable work of the laboratories of Stanford University and the University of California? Why, nothing else but the fact that so many adults of *our* generation—these same public school children grown up to be voters—were *not* taught the fundamental principles of biology and evolutionary science.

From a statement prepared for the Science League of America by Dr. E. Levis Prizer, of North Carolina, I quote an illuminating paragraph:

"Evolution is necessary for an adequate and comprehensive understanding of the natural sciences. In no other way can the mass of data comprising zoology, botany, geology, astronomy,

embryology, palaeontology, and comparative anatomy be fully explained and brought into proper relation with the complete body of human thought. Evolution affords a key—the only satisfactory key to date—to the understanding of things as they are. This explanation is the simplest, most logical, most reasonable ever formulated, and so indispensable as a working tool that had it never been advanced, logical necessity would require its invention to meet the exigencies of the situation. . . . Its application has never been so clearly demonstrated or so forcibly substantiated as in the present-day study of the natural sciences. Here it fits so aptly that to all practical purposes it ceases to be a theory and takes its place among the demonstrable theorems."

Freedom in teaching the best results of modern research and scholarship may not safely be abandoned to the onslaughts of mass ignorance and religious fanaticism. We have no choice but between evolution and magic; between the method of science, which is discovery, and the method of traditionalism, which is revelation from a supernatural source. We must make that choice, and stick by it; and we must make it quickly, for the future of America as a progressive nation hangs perilously in the balance.

There is at stake in this issue not only the question of resistance to sectarian control of our public schools, but also the question of securing the full co-operation of the public in the application of the discoveries constantly being made in the provinces of serology, immunization, and related studies. A nation of children brought up without instruction in the principles of biology and in the methods of science would prove to be easy victims of the multitudinous quacks and fanatics who infest society now as never before in our history. It is obviously

the duty of all friends of freedom to aid in the more general diffusion of biological facts and principles, and this involves the teaching of biology and evolution in our public schools.

In his testimony as a scientific witness in the Scopes case, Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn expressed the views of all broadly educated men and women, and completely confuted the claims of the "Bible opponents" of evolution, in saying:

"The idea of gradual creation known as evolution is essential in education and every branch of human welfare—in medicine, anatomy, surgery, plant and animal industry, the application of geology as well as zoology, psychology, human origins, cultural and anatomical. It is only through our knowledge of the relationships of man with the lower animals that great discoveries and beneficent discoveries have been made in combating disease, beginning with vaccination against smallpox and coming down to the cure of diseases like diphtheria and the treatment of all the germ diseases, where it has been found that the animals most closely related to man yield most readily to the treatment that aids man.

"No act of any legislature in the world can take evolutionary teaching out of education, because it has become an essential and integral part of education. Nor can we take it out of the teachings about man. While possessed of a superior spirit which we call the soul, man in his anatomy is absolutely one with the rest of the mammals, bone by bone, muscle by muscle, blood vessel by blood vessel, gland by gland, tooth by tooth. Man is no exception to the rest of the animal world, and no act of legislation can change him. No teacher can possibly teach zoology or any other branch of science truthfully and intelligently if evolution is left out; the cutting out of evolution from education is exactly like taking the heart from the body, for evolution is at the very heart or center of all education and will always be so. In astronomy the evolution of

the stars has recently been demonstrated; in chemistry and physics the evolution of the chemical elements has recently been demonstrated. Thus the entire universe is shown to be the product of gradual evolution rather than of special and instantaneous creation."

But the issue involved concerns not only the general advance of human knowledge, but, in many cases, human life itself. Prof. Henry Higgins Lane, of the University of Kansas, who has been a teacher and investigator in the field of biology for twenty-six years, states that as a result of fourteen years' teaching in a medical school he is convinced of:

"the absolute necessity of a knowledge of evolutionary principles for the proper understanding on the part of the medical student of many of the abnormalities and variations in structure and functions of organs with which the physician and surgeon is called upon to deal in the practice of his profession" (*Science*, July 17, 1925).

In his Yale address previously quoted, Dr. Dudley J. Morton said:

"Because the indications point to the probability that many of the greatest benefits to mankind resulting from a better understanding of evolution will be of a physical nature and fall within the jurisdiction of the medical profession, it does not seem unreasonable that we should be looked to to take a leading part in this work. The particular confidence and regard with which we are held by the public impose a fearless seeking after truth on our part wherever it may result to their advantage; and because of that confidence, probably nothing would do more to convince the people at large of the truth of evolution than an open declaration of some sort by the profession of our acceptance of its principles and of our firm belief in the advantages to be gained by its further study."

The report of the Committee on Freedom of Teaching of the American Association of University Professors completely demolished the Fundamentalist position in one single paragraph when it remarked:

"It is, we believe, a principle to be rigidly adhered to that the decision as to what is taught as true, or what should be presented as theory in science or in any other field of learning, should be determined not by a popular vote nor by the activities of minorities who are persuaded that certain doctrines are inconsistent with their beliefs, but by the teachers and investigators in their respective fields. It would be absurd for the laity to attempt to dictate to the teachers of medical science what should and what should not be taught as facts in colleges of medicine. Teachers and investigators may teach doctrines in one decade which are discarded in the next; nevertheless, there is no body of individuals more competent than they to decide what doctrines are right, and if mistakes have been made, as they are bound to be with the best of intentions, the teachers and investigators have proved themselves to be the first to discover and to rectify the errors without the assistance of uninformed outsiders. We are never absolutely certain as to what constitutes truth, but if there is any method of insuring that what is taught is true better than that of giving investigators and teachers the utmost freedom to discover and proclaim the truth as they see it, that method has never been discovered. If those who know most about a subject sometimes decide wrongly, matters are not likely to be mended by putting the decision into the hands of those who know less."

Thus was re-echoed the resolution drawn up in 1922 by a committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, composed of three of the most distinguished scientists in America, Dr. Edwin Grant Conklin, Dr. Charles B. Davenport, and Dr. Henry Fair-

field Osborn. This resolution, confirmed in 1925 by a statement of the entire Association, concluded:

"The council of the association is convinced that any legislation attempting to limit the teaching of any scientific doctrine so well established and so widely accepted by scientists as the doctrine of evolution would be a profound mistake, which could not fail to injure and retard the advancement of knowledge and of human welfare by denying the freedom of teaching and inquiry which is essential to all progress."

Here is something for all vacillating boards of education to ponder over. But with the Fundamentalists, things which have been found out by men have no weight as against "truths" which have been "revealed." Their objective, as shown in the Introduction to this book, is (whether consciously or unconsciously) the ultimate establishment in the United States of a Fundamentalist theocracy, based upon their own exclusive ideas of religion, government, and the proper relation of Church to State. And in nearly every state in the Union the Traditionalists are forming political organizations for the purpose of electing to office only "true believers" in their theory of education and government. At the risk of redundancy, let it again be emphasized that each of these co-operating organizations has a dual purpose; namely, to abolish freedom of teaching and to establish, in effect, Fundamentalism as the national (governmental) creed.

In the initial announcement of the National Anti-Evolution Society, to take a typical example, we meet with the following astonishing "whereases":

"Whereas there is a strong organization in the United States whose purpose is the teaching of the unscientific and un-

Christian theory of evolution, and the dissemination of information in support of that theory, and

"Whereas evolution denies the Divine Creation of Man, the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and disparages and belittles the Christian religion and the Creative Powers of God, and

"Whereas the evolutionists are engaged in a campaign to fasten this pernicious doctrine upon the public schools and colleges, and instill this false, absurd, and debauching theory in the youthful minds of the country, and thereby seek to overthrow our Christian Civilization, and all institutions which are based upon a belief in the Supreme Power of God, and the Divinity of Christ, and establish in their stead the materialistic pagan civilization with all its attendant and degrading influences, and

"Whereas it is the established policy of our National and State governments to maintain the public schools as nonsectarian and non-denominational institutions, and *prohibit the teaching of any creed, theory or doctrine not acceptable to all believers in the sacredness of the Bible upon which our governments are founded* [italics mine];

"Therefore it becomes painfully necessary to organize a National Anti-Evolution Society as a defensive organization to combat the erroneous doctrines and theories which are being taught, and which false doctrines are being driven into unsettled minds, through a campaign of misleading assertions and vituperative insinuations and epithets never before equalled in the history of the country."

Here we are told plainly that—contrary to the historical facts—the Government of the United States was founded upon "the sacredness of the Bible," and, by inference, on the "Divinity of Christ," and that "it is the established policy of our National and State governments" to prohibit the teaching of any "theory or doctrine not acceptable to all believers" in these dogmas "on which our governments are founded." This new theory of

the American constitution is being taught daily throughout the nation—even in its capital.

Dr. E. E. Slosson has only too truly said that "Democracy, which is born of freedom, may in turn strangle its mother."

It was precisely because the American people did not believe that even majorities should dictate in matters of religion that the Bill of Rights was incorporated in the Federal Constitution and in nearly every State Constitution. Under Fundamentalist doctrine, any group of sectaries which can muster a majority vote has the right to make its dogma the official creed of the state, by aid of the Legislature, as has already been done in Tennessee and Mississippi. Such an attitude is equivalent to setting up an established church in this republic. Thus, as was pointed out by *The New York World* during the Scopes trial:

> "If a majority of the people of a state are Fundamentalists the schools of that state must teach what they believe. Liberal Protestants, Catholics, Jews and Free Thinkers have no rights which that majority is compelled to respect. The teachers of that state must make science and history conform to the religious opinions of the dominant majority. The children of that state must never, if it can be prevented, be allowed to hear any theory which conflicts with the opinions of the dominant sect."

To be consistent, the Bryanites should be quite ready to concede that if that majority were Mormon, as it is in Utah, it would have the right to make teaching in the public schools conform to Mormonism; if Catholic, as in New Mexico, to the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church; and so on. Needless to say, such consistency

"is far from them." *The World* did not exaggerate in declaring that "since the foundation of this republic no more menacing attack has ever been made upon the freedom of religion."

If it can be shown that this world is not what science teaches us that it is, as Prof. Edwin Linton says:

> "We may then be ready to go back to the days when humanity was passive under the visitation of pestilence and plague, reading in them punishments inflicted by an angry god or gods, for neglecting to offer sacrifices of the proper odor; to those bad times when demons lurked beside the way, and witches wrought their nightly deeds of evil; to that dread age when men cowered in terror at the appearance of a comet in the sky, interpreting it to be a fiery messenger from an angry and jealous potentate above the firmament, who at any time might open gigantic flood-gates in the dome above our heads and bring another Sinflood upon mankind."

As against this "revolt of the unfit"—to borrow Dr. Butler's expression,—we have to-day no effective weapon but organization. Education and enlightenment must go on, of course; the facts of science must be brought to the people as extensively as possible. But already it is too late for that in many parts of the country. The Fundamentalists have forced the issue into the political field, and we must follow them there if we are not to be swamped by them. We must have our defense lobbyists to meet theirs in the legislatures of all the menaced states; we must fill the threatened sections of the country with speakers, and flood them with explanatory printed matter, as they do.

It was in the realization of this fact that the American Association of University Professors, meeting at Phila-

delphia with the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in January, 1927, adopted a resolution by Prof. A. O. Lovejoy of John Hopkins University,

"That this association take the initiative in bringing about a more effective co-operation between all groups of organizations interested in opposing legislative restrictions on freedom of teaching in state-supported institutions and in defending the principle of the separation of church and state in educational matters."

(Practically every professional and scientific society, including the National Education Association, has now expressed itself as opposed to anti-evolution legislation. The Science League of America, however, remains the only body specifically devoted to that opposition and to no other object.)

In other words, to put it succinctly, only a strongly and solidly organized counter-federation of men and women who understand the method and findings of science, and believe they must be preserved if civilization is to survive in America, can overcome the propaganda and legislation of the anti-evolutionists.

In the fine words of John Emerson Roberts:

"Science has been resisted in every age. Slowly and painfully she has advanced, but never turned back. Great to-day are her achievements—great her marvels, staggering credulity; and yet she is threatened to-day as never before. We—and let it be written large—we, who boast of our republic, of our wealth, of our progress, of our virtues in general, and, heaven help us! of our intelligence, we, the people, are preparing for the crucifixion of science, the savior of the world. . . .

"This is but the beginning—the other states will follow. Science will be hunted from place to place. A fugitive and out-

cast, she will be exiled from the land she has helped to make great, . . . unless—

"Organized minorities have ruled, and will rule, this country, unless—

"The freedom that we now enjoy, a freedom bought for us, with the blood and toil of generations past, we shall lose, unless—

"In the dens and caverns of superstition are now being forged chains destined for us, and those chains we shall wear, unless—

"It is splendid to be free, but freedom won by brave men can be retained only by brave defenders. Already she is passing from us, and will pass, unless—

"*Unless we fight!* Ignorance has declared war. Ignorance says science must go. Ignorance has spoken—the war is here. It is the old war, age-old and never-ending war. The army of ignorance is organized, equipped and in the field. The army of defense—there is no army of defense. Here and there sentinels are on guard, but there is no army. . . . Too many of the free are content to be free, but unwilling to defend their freedom. . . .

"It is sad to think that perhaps mankind is not worthy of nor qualified for freedom. Perhaps the chain and the shackle must be worn again. It may be that science must again enter the dungeon, or roam in exile, and mankind go back to the twilight, and again work its way out. It may be, and will be, *unless those who are free get into the fight and help defend the freedom that has been won for them.*"

APPENDIX

I

SPEECHES DELIVERED AT MASS MEETING OF SCIENCE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, SAN FRANCISCO, NOVEMBER 14, 1925

SCIENCE AND CIVILIZATION: BY LUTHER BURBANK (1849–1926)

CIENCE is knowledge arranged and classified according to truth, facts and the general law of nature.

Our Dr. Jordan defines it more briefly as "organized human knowledge" or "human experience tested and set in order."

There are always at least two sides to every question which may be suggested to the human mind. Sometimes both views are correct but far more often one is right and according to facts and truth, the other wrong. All our personal, social, moral and national success depends upon the judicious wisdom of our choices made by the aid of science. Narrow personal prejudices and feelings quite too often becloud the issue and ultimate defeat is the inevitable result.

Life as we see it around us on this planet is usually thought to be confined to man, animals and plants, those organisms which grow and reproduce their kind with more or less precision. Why should we omit crystals which grow as truly as plants and reproduce themselves quite as precisely to type, or the more primitive forms

of life which are reproduced by division? Science is proving that the world is not half dead but that every atom is *all life* and motion.

Life is self-expression, intricate organized polarity. The lure of happiness and the fear of pain are fundamental qualities possessed by all living things and are the two forces which have through untold millennia kept what we usually call life from destruction by the ever encroaching outside forces of destruction. Life is heredity plus environment. At birth of a planet, animal or man, heredity has already been fixed. Environment may now call into action only those tendencies which have been experienced in the age long past, yet may recombine and intensify them in a most surprising way. It is limited generally to the individual, but by slow increments, generation after generation, these by repetition continued in the lives of individuals at last become fixed and available in the species.

Assimilation and reproduction are and of course must be fundamental and universal. The power of adaptation to various conditions which beset all life may also be considered as fundamental for the continuation of any species. All these various powers of adaptation have to be acquired individually and repeated indefinitely until so fixed in the life stream that they are reproduced. *Repetition* is the means of impressing any quality or character in animal life or in man, and by just the same means plants are impressed, and their qualities and habits changed as we desire. All life depends upon a series of selections and repetitions.

The first faint glimmerings of choice may be seen in the polarity of the magnet, next we see it perhaps in

plants and the more primitive forms of life, and as we mount higher and higher in the scale of life there is more and more freedom of choice and less dependence upon heredity.

Ancient tribes and nations had many gods, often one for almost every phenomenon of nature. The Hebrews have the credit of inventing our Jewish-Christian god, who however is represented as jealous, cruel, vindictive and having most of the weaknesses and bad habits of primitive man; the god *within* us is the *only* available god we know and the clear light of science teaches us that we must be our own saviors if we are to be found worth saving, in other words to depend upon the "kingdom within." The manhood and womanhood which would make the most of life in *service* to others is a sublimated form of the best of self and which leads the way to a long lifetime of happiness, health and peace.

There are without doubt some human beings in every nation who according to our present standards of civilization are truly civilized, but grave doubts may be entertained as to any community or any nation who could in any way measure up even to this standard scale of life where we find more and more *freedom*. Even man today is far from free. Slaves yet to war, crime and ignorance—the only "unpardonable sin." Slaves to unnumbered ancient "taboos," superstitions, prejudices and fallacies which one by one are slowly but surely weakening under the clear light of the morning of Science, the savior of mankind—science which has opened our eyes to the vastness of the universe and given us light, truth and freedom from fear where once was darkness, ignorance and superstition. There is no personal salvation,

there is no national salvation, except through Science.

There are too few who exploit the inexhaustible forces of nature and far too many who exploit their fellow beings. Useless waste and unnecessary parasitism take at least nine tenths of the productive capacity of the United States.

Will the growing intelligence of man (Science) forever tolerate the wholesale production of the ever increasing proportion of idiots, morons, mongoloids, insane, criminal, weak, destitute, nervous, diseased half-men and women who infest the earth to their own sorrow and disgrace and perhaps the ultimate destruction of our present state of civilization? A *knowledge* of the fundamental laws of nature, not inefficient palliatives, is the *first* step. Is there a problem equal to the building of a better humanity? Our lives as we live them are passed on to others, whether in physical or mental forms, tinging all future lives forever. This should be enough for one who lives for truth and service to his fellow passengers on the way. No avenging Jewish god, no satanic devil, no fiery hell is of any interest to him. Religion and Science should have no differences. Every human being is more or less religious. The Scientist is a lover of truth for the very love of truth itself wherever it may lead. Every normal human being has ideals, one or many, to look up to, reach up to, to grow up to. Religion refers to the sentiments and feelings. Science refers to the demonstrated every-day laws of Nature. Feelings are all right if one does not get drunk on them. Prayer is elevating if combined with works, and they who labor with head, hands or feet have faith and are generally quite sure of a favorable reply.

Those who take refuge behind theological barbed wire fences quite often wish they could have more freedom of thought but fear the change to the great ocean of scientific truth as they would a cold bath plunge.

Those who would legislate against the teaching of evolution should also legislate against gravity, electricity and the unreasonable velocity of light, and also should introduce a clause to prevent the use of the telescope, the microscope and the spectroscope or any other instrument of precision which may in the future be invented, constructed or used for the discovery of truth.

FREEDOM OF KNOWLEDGE: BY DAVID STARR JORDAN

(Chancellor Emeritus, Leland Stanford University)

"Keep freedom in the schools and keep intolerance out." We do not ask that evolution be put in or kept in the schools for truth will take its own chance any time, anywhere. Intolerance must be kept out. I would not keep out the Bible—the Book of Genesis—nor one chapter of it. The trouble is not with Genesis, but with its misuse, the use of its philosophy and poetry in order to check the growth of knowledge as reality above tradition.

The Book of Genesis is an honest book, telling what men without books, and without instruments of precision, with none of our many ways of testing truth, had

heard or imagined concerning the origin of the world. We have a better way of knowing than the Hebrew prophets had. Moreover, I think every man should have the opportunity to give his message, whatever that may be. Truth can take care of itself. I am in sympathy with the London policeman, in Hyde Park. He had listened to a soap-box speaker denouncing the Queen, but did not arrest him because, as he said, "It does 'im a lot of good and don't 'urt 'er." I have no objection to what men with whom I do not agree may say, so long as they do not use force of law to prevent freedom to know or to express on the part of others.

Personally I like Bryan. The trouble with Bryan is he does not read bound books—not even the Bible, so theologians claim. I once heard him say: "I hope it may be said of me that I have done something to rid the world of its two greatest curses—drink and war." For the good he has done, I will pardon any lapse in economics or biology.

The harm intolerance does is great. It drives students away from what they think is Christianity, because Christianity is overloaded with a lot of matters, creeds, ceremonies, symbolisms, that have no vital relation to it, and this drives them away from organizations and thus blinds them to the real nature and purpose of Christianity.

The religion of Jesus is bared in one "who went about doing good." One who visited the widow and the fatherless and kept himself unspotted from the world. Real Christianity is well summed up in those words in the Gospel of St. James. To many young men it seems that Christianity is tied up with ancient poems and

legends, and the belief that all figurative expression, of which all Oriental literature is full, must be taken literally.

Religions die, but religion never. Religion finds expressive reverence towards unseen power, and through these, expression in duty, in service, and in love. Duty springs from love and reverence, and in our ignorance, the feeling of reverence may be synonymous with superstition. Superstition is believing something which you know is not true. There are so many superstitions—the rites of sacrifice, the worship of idols, the divine right of kings, the total depravity of man. The effect of binding Christianity to the reverence of the Middle Ages is disastrous to the young college man.

Some two hundred years ago, the venerable Archbishop Ussher applied himself to guess the age of the world. "Heaven and earth," he declared, "center and circumference, were created all together in the same instant, the clouds full of water, on October 23, 4004 B. C., at nine o'clock in the morning." As to the creation of man, a group of wise men in South Carolina once "Resolved that man was created by an instantaneous process without previous animal parentage," and these and other crude notions of ignorant men have been supposed to be "Bible Truths" as against the knowledge of Nature, that is of God's Truth revealed every day to those who give their lives to it.

My topic tonight is "Freedom of Knowledge." Teachers must have freedom, then if they have understanding and ability they can't go far wrong. Evolution and nature mean the same thing—"Orderly change." To say that we should not study evolution is to say we

should not study the earth or the stars, the plants, the animals, the growth of humanity. All nature is in the process of changing—nothing can escape change. That is the basis of progress. Those who run the gauntlet of life leave progeny who, like their parents, were fitted to survive, who were adaptable to their environment.

Science is human experience tested and set in order. Every observation must be tested to see if the experience is true. Once a fanatic told Martin Luther that a spirit had told him some matter of importance. Luther said, "I slap that ghost on the snout." We don't believe in experiences until they have been tested. The atmosphere is filled with claims which science cannot accept. A series of unrelated facts proves little or nothing. Then when you have tested experience and set experience in order you will find that science is never complete; it is always moving forward—a theory is held only until one that better fits the facts takes its place. When scientists found stars, suns and planets kept in place by gravitation, were always falling and never hitting, we could not go back to the idea that stars were pin holes in clear celestial spheres through which the light of heaven shone. You could not go back to the teaching of philosophers who instructed that the sun did not give heat and light, when you have felt the heat and seen the light.

Getting back to the theory that the world was created 4004 years before Christ—on October 23 at nine o'clock in the morning—it would be interesting to know what became of the first 22 days of October and what was done before nine o'clock that particular morning.

The scientist wants to get hold of facts. He does not

like to be dogmatic about things he knows nothing of. Scientists have definite knowledge of certain things and use that knowledge. There is nothing truer than anything that's true. Nothing is true to you unless you understand the meaning of the words in which you behold it. Many people who accept evolution don't know what it is. They are not much help to science. We are not asking a majority vote. The men who know are always in the minority. All science asks is freedom to work. "Old errors do not die because they are refuted; they fade out because they are neglected." Arguments for evolution do not seem necessary. You can see that everything changes—orderly changes. Each change follows its order. Change on the one hand, order in change on the other—each and all the work of Deity, the work of the highest power in the Universe, whatever the name you may choose to give it.

No scientific man ever claimed that man is a developed monkey nor that a monkey is a degenerate man. We have every reason to believe that all life is bound together, diverging from primitive stock as limbs from a tree.

The function of science is, in the main, threefold. First, its practical aspect—engineering, sanitation. Second, its ethical aspect—from the tested experience of man we learn what is right or wrong, and religious conscience tells us to do what is right but does not tell us what is right. Conscience alone without knowledge may not help us. The wickedest deeds in the world were often performed with clear conscience. The third aspect of science arises through the expansion of the human mind. To find out truth strengthens the individual and the

race. Truth was not laid before humanity through any special interpretation. To find out for ourselves is the noblest of the duties laid on humanity. It was a part of the mission of Jesus to show that the boundless power which holds the universe "as in the hollow of his hand" is the same power which has implanted in man the spirit of altruism through which flows all happiness and through which Love becomes "the greatest thing in the world." For, indeed, Love is "Heaven's very atmosphere."

WHAT IS AT STAKE IN THE EFFORT TO PREVENT PEOPLE FROM STUDYING EVOLUTION? BY WILLIAM E. RITTER

(President, Science Service, Washington, D. C.)

If man's understanding of himself and the wonderful universe in which he lives, moves and has his being, grows during the next thirty-five years as it has grown during the last sixty-five, the generations yet unborn will look back to the century thus specified as one of the most stupendous for the human spirit of any in the whole history of living beings upon the earth.

The beginning of that century would be 1859, the year Darwin's *Origin of Species* became a common possession of mankind. That date and that book identify the period in a peculiar way with the modern doctrine of evolution. But while the coming of that doctrine was the transcendent event of the period it was far from

the only event by which humanity added greatly to its spiritual riches during the time. Some dozen other first-order advances in natural knowledge—in astronomy, in physics, and chemistry, in geology and in biology—have broadened and deepened man's understanding of the system of nature in a measure only a little less than has the doctrine of evolution itself.

Also man's information about himself as an intelligent, a moral, a social and a spiritual being has made giant strides during this time. But this *information* he has failed to transmute into *understanding*. He has not grasped what the developmental process means for his own higher life: the significance of evolution for human welfare.

We have learned many facts which justify the conclusion that the whole plant and animal world, and man's body, have originated by a developmental process. We have also gained much knowledge about the minds of men and of animals. We have not, however, brought the two kinds of knowledge together, to see what each kind can teach us about the meaning of the other kind, and especially what both teach us that is of significance for man's higher life.

When this synthesis is made, we see with startling clarity that man's destiny is in his own hands in a sense we had not suspected before. The facts of the developmental origin of the spirit as well as the body of man constitute a Magna Charta of the human soul. It is man's to choose between a future more noble or one more ignoble than anything his past has seen.

This latent capacity of man for mastery over his own

destiny has been slowly and fitfully gaining ground in his consciousness through the whole period of evolutionary teaching. But now as never before he is perceiving what the condition is for continued advance in the same direction. That condition is that he shall develop for himself a more logical and comprehensive philosophy of life, a more safety-insuring system of morals, and a more practically potent religious faith than he has ever yet evolved; and that such a philosophy, such a morality, and such a religion are possible only on the basis of a knowledge of and confidence in the natural that will not have room for one jot or tittle of belief in the supernatural.

If you ask what researches are most powerful in bringing our understanding up to this stage, I answer that above all other present-day researches those in the nature of the human spirit, particularly in its highest manifestations, are most potent in forcing these conclusions upon us. Overwhelming evidence for the derivative origin of all organic beings is supplied by fossils, by embryos, by the details of structure of full-grown plants and animals, and by the activities of all living beings. But the meaning for human life and well-being of this whole marvellous spectacle can only be grasped by understanding the workings of intelligence, thought, reason, passion, instinct as means for enabling the beings possessed of these to solve more and more successfully the problems of their existence upon the earth.

The realization of this gives men a vantage point from which to attack human problems, and the courage of past achievements to hearten them for the advance. To

forbid the teaching of evolution would mean taking away from our children the guarantee that man may go on using the means by which he has already attained something of the glory of life to the attainment of that glory in a much fuller measure.

II

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAYS ON "WHY EVOLUTION SHOULD BE TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS"

1.

A comprehensive answer to this question is readily given: because the evolution of our planet and its life-forms is the nearest approach to Truth of which we are now capable. To teach aught but the truth as we know it is the ultimate offense of any teacher.

But a number of specifications of this general answer are possible. What one learns in early childhood takes deep root. To unlearn it completely is all but impossible. New modes of thought require effort, old ones are impulsive, immediate, seemingly axiomatic. The naturalistic attitude towards the universe is hopelessly handicapped so long as a supernaturalistic attitude is inculcated in our early years. To postpone till high school or college years the teaching of evolution is to impose a heavy weight of inertia upon the thinking of the relatively well educated and to leave the vast majority of men in unnecessary ignorance. The power of militant Fundamentalism derives from its control of education during fundamental and formative years.

The dislocation of personality consequent upon the conflict of faiths is an even more important reason. No one who has seen the minds of students rent in twain as they try in vain to reconcile the mythological Hebrew cosmology and modern science, can fail to realize the poignant character of the struggle. No doubt the tougher minded emerge from the struggle unscathed, if not strengthened. But visibly in far too many cases, personality is disintegrated. Reason, facts, the authority of science cannot be denied; but old thought paths are not abandoned. A wretched, half-hearted compromise (a compromise not unlike that reached by society as a whole at the close of the great debate about organic evolution at the close of the nineteenth century), which lets not one cerebral hemisphere know what the other thinketh, mocks all pretense at intellectual honesty and results in disordered and divided personality.

Education, if it be not a high-spirited adventure in the search for truth, degenerates into a tyrannical regimentation of childish bodies and minds. The issue of truth must be met in the kindergarten and elementary school, not postponed to the university. Education cannot persist half slave and half free.

HORACE B. ENGLISH,
Professor of Psychology, Antioch College.

2.

IN the first place the evolutionary explanation of the origin of the earth and of man is a type of explanation which has always worked, whereas the explanation given in Genesis is a type which has always failed.

Whenever man has been confronted with a mystery which he could not interpret by earthly principles, he has temporarily invoked the aid of the supernatural. An unanswerable riddle is seemingly a frustration which the human race has never been able to bear. Thunder was once said to be caused by the chariot of a god rolling across the firmament; the fiery thunder-bolts were the god's weapons. When the angels opened the windows of heaven it rained. Insanity was the result of being possessed of devils. Witches made men wicked, soured milk, and tangled the manes of the peasants' horses. Tens of thousands of the mysteries of old were explained as the work of gods, devils, ghosts, witches, angels, spirits, fairies or others of the supernatural family; but in every instance when the mystery was finally understood, the supernatural explanation has proved false: the true explanation has proved a natural one.

On the basis, then, of all the past experience of mankind, we may presume that whatever the true explanation of the origin of the earth and of man is, it is almost certainly not of a supernatural character. This consideration alone ought to rule out of our schools the teaching of Genesis.

In the second place, the evolutionary account lends greater dignity to man. The account in Genesis assumes a planned universe and in such a creation man can have no real freedom. He is a servant who must do the will of a master. Unquestioning servitude, however, is a vice which is rapidly vanishing from the earth. The evolutionary hypothesis gives us an opportunity, at least, to banish it from the entire cosmos. If man and his world are in the making, if we dispense with the idea

of a preordained plan, then man may regard *himself* as a creative agent—a free-born citizen in a democratic universe.

"But," our Fundamentalist friends will say, "how do you find any dignity in this monkey business?" Evolutionists have always insisted that there is not much to choose, from the standpoint of dignity, between monkeys and mud. If we are to select our hypothesis on the basis of aesthetic raw materials, let us reject both Genesis and Darwin. Roses and violets, or morning dew with perhaps a few sprinkles of starlight, would be much more appropriate as source material than either monkeys or mud. But all this is beside the point. We are now what we are regardless of our ancestry.

In the third place, the evolutionary hypothesis offers more for the future. If the creation was once and for all and the creator saw that it was "good," there is no room for progress. On the other hand, if we have come all the way from a pinch of protoplasm to where we are now, there is no limit to the goal we may reasonably set for ourselves in the future. Moreover, we can hope and expect that the social and intellectual gap between us and the men of the future will be as great as the gulf between us and the anthropoids.

In other words, the doctrine of evolution is a doctrine of hope, of growth and development. The gospel of Genesis leaves us floundering in a world that has already gone irreparably to "the bow-wows."

FAY W. CLOWER,
Professor of Sociology, State College of Washington.

3.

ALL educational theory must be based finally upon a philosophy of education and this in turn upon a philosophy of life. A philosophy that views the world as miraculous; that ignores careful exploration and examination of the causes of phenomena; that concludes that all human endeavor must be foreordained or it is without significance; that insists that the will of God finds expression in but one place and one way, such a philosophy is poor stuff upon which to base a theory, or a philosophy of education. The philosophy of Genesis is of such a nature.

A careful examination of the philosophy of Genesis must lead one to the conclusion that we live in a world, both physical and spiritual, that is finished—completed—dead; that there can be no place for change of an orderly nature. Such changes as do occur are catastrophic and are indicative of the whims of an impulsive, petulant deity. There can be no place for intelligence or the intelligent adaptation of men to changing environment. The scientific attitude of suspended judgment can have no place in the scheme, because the scheme is preconceived and in the hands of a tribal god. Genesis is not concerned with the large problems of modern society—the social, economic and political questions that threaten to destroy us unless we master them.

Evolution frankly faces a changing world. It is confident that the physical world came to its present state through a long period of time and by strict conformity to basic laws of nature. It knows that men have evolved

from a lower state to their present position and it is hopeful that they will through the power of creative evolution, *i. e.*, that of intelligent thought, lift themselves still higher. It views change as a natural and normal thing and only asks that it be orderly and not too wasteful. Evolution permits the development of scientific thought and research and encourages the tentative attitude of mind that makes progress possible.

Here are briefly contrasted two philosophies that are struggling for mastery in our school system. To base an educational system on the first is to produce a product that scoffs at science, regards all problems of men as relatively unimportant, assumes that moral and ethical values are miraculously revealed, encourages superstition and the worship of false gods. The product of the second regards men as they live together as of supreme importance, attempts to discover the causes of strain and stress; knows that we have not reached perfection in any field of human endeavor; frankly adopts a tentative attitude of mind; faces the future earnestly, courageously and hopefully; has faith in the goodness of God as expressed through the minds of men; and works hard for a new and better order of things, knowing that anything that is for the betterment of mankind must add to the glory of God.

TRUMAN G. REED,
Principal, Central Intermediate School, Wichita, Kansas.

(Judges of the Contest: James Rorty, Arthur Preston Hankins, Miriam Allen deFord.)

INDEX OF NAMES

Abel, Rev. Theodore Curtis, 262
Acuff, Rev. Judd, 193
Aitcherson, Rev. H. J., 310
Alameda High School Alumni Association, 271
Alexander, Rep. Julia, 97
Allen, Dr. W. E., 277
American Association for the Advancement of Science, 379
American Association for Medical Progress, 264, 277
American Association of University Professors, 189, 379, 383
American Civil Liberties Union, 202, 277
American Mercury, 90, 100, 114, 134, 145, 162, 168, 178, 181, 308, 319, 323
Argonaut, 252, 277
Arkansas Gazette, 165
Arnett, Eugene, 354
Atlanta Journal, 129
Atlantic Monthly, 250
Avery, Dr. Samuel, 326
Aynesworth, Dr. H. K., 181

Babbitt, Arthur, 343
Backus, Rev. E. Burdette, 260
Baer, Dr. John Willis, 257
Baker, Rev. Alonzo, 267
Baker, Gov. Sam A., 154
Baldwin, Dr. A. H., 159
Ballou, Dr. Frank W., 362
Baltimore Sun, 102
Baptist Advance, 112
Baptist Fundamentalist, 51, 294
Baptist Standard, 75
Baptist Temple News, 243, 249
Baptist Trumpet, 290
Barbour, Prof. E. H., 326
Barker, Prof. Franklin D., 326
Barnard, Dr. L. W., 290
Bassett, S. A., 332
Better Health, 212
Beer, Thomas, 188
Behnken, Rev. J. W., 251
Bell, Dr. Sturgiss, 150
Bernard, James D., 162, 180
Biblical Recorder, 116
Bierce, Ambrose, 240
Bird, Rev. Dr. Levi, 308
Birmingham News, 141
Birmingham Post, 48
Black, Rev. J. R., 126
Blake, Rev. Berkeley B., 277
Blanton, Rep. Thomas L., 359, 363

Blease, Sen. Cole, 116, 366
Bluske, Rev. Charles F., 95, 100
Bob Shuler's Magazine, 255
Bogard, Rev. Ben M., 170
Bootle, England, viii
Boston Traveler, 120
Boyd, Thomas, 131
Boyd, Pres. Thomas D., 79, 80
Braxton, W. C., 143
Bredow, J. F., 324
Briegleb, Rev. Dr. G. A., 257
Brewster, Edwin Tenney, 291
Brewster, Gov. Ralph O., 299
Brisbane, Arthur, 211, 368
Brooklyn Daily Eagle, 364
Brooks, Prof. Robert Preston, 133
Brooks, Pres. S. D., 160
Brooks, Pres. S. P., 179
Broughton, Rev. Dr. Len G., 139
Brown, Rev. Dr. Arthur I., 123, 276
Browne, Sir Thomas, 47
Brush, Rev. Dr. Frank S., 260
Bryan, William Jennings, 11, 22, 119, 127, 130, 146, 148, 154, 163, 192, 200, 211, 213, 217, 224, 254, 257, 311, 391
Bryan Bible League, 255
Bubar, Rev. B. C., 299, 301
Buchanan, Aimee, 123
Bulgin, Rev. E. J., 28
Bundy, Dr. Walter, 318
Burbank, Luther, 154, 229
Bush, C., 166
Butcher, Rev. L. R., 347
Butler, Rep. John Washington, 193
Butler, Dr. Nicholas Murray, 214

California Medical Association, 275
California Methodist Episcopal Church Conference, 258
California Protestant Episcopal Conference, 277
California Synod Presbyterian Church, 256
Callahan, Patrick H., 207
Campbell, Pres. William Wallace, 242, 277
Cantrell, Edward A., 351
Cardiff, Dr. Ira D., 348
Carolina Independent, 106
Carpenter, Roscoe, 46
Carr, Dr. H. Wilson, 298
Catt, Carrie Chapman, 320, 351
Chapin, Dr. F. Stuart, 311
Charlotte Observer, 101, 105
Chase, Pres. Harry W., 92
Chicago Tribune, 155
Christian Herald, 250, 370
Christian Reformer, 30
Christian Register, 60
Christian Science Publication Committee, 273
Clarke, Edward Young, 24, 47, 48, 314

Cobb, Maud Barker, 128, 131
Cochran, N. D., 23, 112
Coffee, Dr. Rudolph I., 258
Cohn, Sam M., 277
Coleman, George E., 264
Colton, Henry E., 235
Columbus Enquirer-Sun, 131
Committee of One Hundred, 103
Conflict, 51, 90
Congdon, Rev. Dr. James E., 153
Conklin, Prof. Edwin Grant, 210, 379
Connaly, Rep. Tom, 359
Conrad, Rev. S. F., 102
Cooke, Rev. George A., 297
Copeland, Sen. Royal, 366
Cornell, Ezra, 282
Crane, Rep. Roscoe, 299
Crombie, Rev. Albert H., 315
Cross, Prof. Laurence, 259
Crusader, 59
Crusaders' Champion, 53, 58, 70, 78, 85, 102, 176, 290, 323
Cumberland Presbyterian Bulletin, 231
Cunningham, Clarice, 336
Curran, C. C., 316
Curtis, Prof. W. C., 210

Dabney, Virginius, 145
Darrow, Clarence, 56, 179, 207, 218
Davenport, Dr. Charles B., 379
Deer Creek Pilot, 71
Defenders, 329
Delaney, Pres. Henry J., 150
Delk, Rev. Edwin Heyl, 322
Delmas, Delphin M., 224
Demaree, Dr. Ralph G., 119
Denver Clarion, 222
Denver Labor Bulletin, 339
Denver News, 338
Dickson, James S., 272
Dicky, Bishop James E., 180
Dieffenbach, Rev. Dr. Albert A., 60, 215
Dietrich, Rev. John H., 6
Dow, Dr. Henry, 178
Driesch, Dr. H. A. E., 298
Durham County Progress, 106

Eastern Baptist Convention of California and Oregon, 272
Educational Association, Methodist Episcopal Church South, 235
Elder, Benedict, 207
Ellis, Dr. Robert A., 190
Ellwood, Prof. Charles A., 155, 156, 312
El Paso Herald, 175
El Paso Times, 170
England, Howell S., 104
Erwin, R. L., Jr., 185
Everett, Rep. R. O., 92
Ewer, Dr. Edward N., 275

Federated Council Churches of

Christ in America, 145
Ferguson, Gov. Miriam A., 174
Few, Pres. W. P., 235
Fielding, William J., 156
Fiske, Rev. Albert R., 328
Flint Daily Herald, 308
Floyd, Rev. I. K., 227
Floyd, William, 67
Ford, Henry, 47
Forum, 32, 131, 133, 209, 223, 291, 367
Fosdick, Rev. Harry Emerson, 285, 286
Fountain, Rev. Charles Hillman, 296
Fox, Dr. Henry, 135
Frank, Dr. Henry, 262, 281
Fritz, Rev. John H., 252
Fulks, Clay, 168
Fuller, Edgar L., 24
Fundamentalist Federation, 346
Fundamentalists' Association, 122

Galbraith, J. B., 178
Gale, Linn A. E., 106
Galloway, Dr. D. H., 292
Garland, Dr. Lindon Cabell, 188
Gerard, Frank, 252
Gerhardt, Raymond, 171
Gibney, Eugene, 287
Giddings, Prof. Franklin H., 302
Glannon, Archbishop John J., 19
Glen Rio Tribune, 342
Godsey, John L., 204
Goldsmith, Prof. William M., 210, 330, 350
Goslin, Rev. Dr. Omar, 277
Gosline, Dr. Harold I., 182
Graves, Gov. Bibb, 141
Gregory, Leonard, 14
Grey, Zane, 126
Grossmann, A. A., 251
Gruenberg, Dr. Benjamine C., 9, 174, 245

Hagen, Rev. Fred W., 147
Hagerstown Morning Herald, 151
Haggard, Wallace S., 203
Haldeman-Julius Monthly, 61, 77, 101, 185, 226, 304, 329, 333, 337
Haldeman-Julius Weekly, 328
Hall, Grover C., 140
Ham, Rev. M. F., 89
Hamilton, James, 344
Harper's Magazine, 95, 286
Harris, J. E., 143
Harris, Julia and Julian, 131, 134
Harris, T. H., 85
Hartt, Rollin Lynde, 31, 217
Hastings, Rep. James, 297
Hawley, Victor B., 324
Hay, Prof. W. P., 362
Hays, Arthur Garfield, 287
Hays, Rep. J. M., 149
Heisinger, Assemblyman S. L., 276, 277

Herald of Christ's Kingdom, 293
Hibben, Pres. John Greer, 296
Hicks, Sue K., 203
Hill, Rep. Lew, 193
"Hilton, Gregory," 178
Hojbierg, Rev. C. P., 322
Holmes, Rev. Dr. John Haynes, 287
Honor Society, Riverside Junior College, 268, 277
Hoskins, Dean J. D., 190
Hough, Rev. Lynn H., 307
Houghton, William Morris, 74
Hughes, Vice-Pres. Charles Evans, 309
Hull, Rev. Dr. Marion McH., 129
Hume, Dr. Alfred, 71
Huneycutt, A. C., 94
Hunt, Dr. George E., 310
Hunt, Gov. George W. P., 343
Hunter, Dr. George W., 85, 201, 204
Hussein, Dr. T. E., 131
Hutchinson, W. K., 203
Huxley, Thomas, 240

International Congress of Philosophy, 298

Jackson, Rep. C. C., 159
Jackson Daily Clarion, 63
Jarrell, Arch W., 337
Jarrell, Rev. W. A., 180
Johnson, Rep. Grover C., 121
Johnston, Supt. Marshall, 174
Johnston, Rev. S. J., 180
Jones, Rep. Arthur, 169
Jordan, Dr. David Starr, 88, 121, 249

Kearney, Sen. Belle, 70
Kelly, Robert L., 125
Kent, Frank R., 61
Kentucky Academy of Science, 122
Kerr, Prof. James Graham, 241
Kimberley, Rep. Hal, 130
Kincaid, Prov. Trevor, 350
King, J. R., 117
King's Business, 22, 280
Knoxville News, 219
Koehler, Dr. Wolfgang, 151, 192
Kofoid, Dr. Charles A., 267, 270
Kretzschmar, Rev. Earl, 162, 252
Krutch, Joseph Wood, 5, 215
Ku Klux Klan, 24, 25, 36, 105, 133, 140, 193, 255, 305, 319, 344
Kunderd, A. E., 318

Lait, Jack, 218
La Mar, William H., 35
Lane, Prof. Henry Higgins, 378
Langley, Rep. John W., 126
Laws, Rev. Dr. Curtis Lee, 29
Le Buffe, Rev. Francis, 19
Le Conte, Dr. Joseph, 134
Leecraft, Rep. A. N., 335

Lehlbach, Rep. Frederick R., 363
Lewis, Nell Battle, 90
Lexington Herald, 120
Liggett, Walter W., 61
Lindley, C. T., 324
Lindsay, Rep. Paul, 129
Linton, Prof. Edwin B., 11, 12, 37, 136, 241, 250, 383
Literary Digest, 172
Little Rock Science Club, 165
Livingston, Dr. Burton E., 119
Locke, Bishop Charles Edward, 313
Logan, Rep. David M., 336
Los Angeles Examiner, 40
Louisiana Baptist Convention, 83
Louisville Courier-Journal, 126
Love, Wade H., 93
Lovejoy, Prof. Arthur O., 384
Lowrey, Rep. Bill, 36
Lummis, Dr. Charles F., 263
Lyons, Rev. Dr. Arthur G., 139

MacCaughey, Vaughn, 244
MacDaniel, Rep. S. D., 159
MacFarland, Charles, 125
Macon Daily Telegraph, 48, 136
Madden, Rep. Martin B., 363
Maher, Rev. Zaccheus, 246
Malick, Rev. John, 307
Malone, Dudley Field, 319
Mangasarian, Dr. M. M., 27
Mann, Dr. Paul B., 283
Marshall, Vice-Pres. Thomas R., 39
Martin, Dr. Mabel F., 227
Martin, Rev. T. T., 51, 64, 67, 90, 96, 102, 107
Martin, Walter Clare, 329
Martineau, Gov. John E., 165, 167
Mather, Dr. Kirtley, 210
Mathews, Dr. Shailer, 210
Matthews, Rev. Mark, 346
Maupin, Mayor J. C., 152
Mays, Rev. Dr. Livingston T., 140
McCann, Dr. Alfred, 19
McClure, C. H., 357
McConnell, Rev. Dr. F. C., 129
McIlvaine, H. R., 145
McKay, Rev. Dr. Charles F., 290
McLean, Rep. Carrie, 97
McNair, Prof. A. D., 164, 165, 167
McPherson, Aimee Semple, 252
McPherson, Rev. Dr. George, 285
Mecklin, Dr. John M., 72
Meeman, Edward, 236
Mell, Rev. John O., 129
Mencken, H. L., 114
Merz, Charles, 35
Methodist Board of Temperance, Prohibition and Public Morals, 33, 357
Metcalf, Dr. Maynard M., 210, 304

Metcalf, Dr. Z. P., 85
Meyer, Fred, 253
Michigan Christian Advocate, 308
Middleton, Dr. Austin R., 122
Miller, Dr. Arthur M., 120, 210
Miller, Rev. Morton, 333
Minneapolis Tribune, 314
Mississippian, 71
Modern World, 289
Montague, Dr. William Hepperell, 295
Montgomery Advertiser, 97, 140, 142, 144
Moody, Gov. Dan, 175
Moon, Prof. Truman, 173, 245
Moore, Bishop John M., 180
Morgan, Pres. Harcourt A., 191
Moroney, Rev. L. G., 78
Morrison, Gov. Cameron, 88, 120
Morton, Dr. Dudley J., 302, 378
Mulvania, Dean Maurice, 190
Musgrave, Dr. W. E., 211

Nation, 5, 31, 215, 217, 222, 287
National Anti-Evolution Society, 154, 380
National Education Association, 384
National Reformers, 25
National Student Federation of America, 264
Neal, Judge John Randolph, 190, 204, 221, 232, 234
Nestos, Gov. Ragnald Anderson, 315
Neunaber, Rev. H. W., 314
New Menace, 306
New Republic, 35
New York Sun, 120, 205, 220
New York Times, 17, 19, 176, 198, 288, 298
New York World, 222, 282, 327
Newman, Dr. Louis I., 267, 277
Noel, Rep. Pastor B., 355
Nolan, Webster K., 275
Norlin, Pres. George, 200
Norris, Rev. Dr. J. Frank, 171, 172, 177, 179, 288
North Carolina Academy of Sciences, 89
Northern Baptist Convention, 365
Northern California Congregational Conference, 258
Northrop, Rev. A., 154

O'Connell, Cardinal William H., 297
Ojai, 253
Omaha World-Herald, 336
Osborn, Prof. Henry Fairfield, 292, 325, 377, 379
Osborne, Clyde W., 306
O'Shea, Dr. W. J., 287
O'Toole, Dr. George Barry, 19
Outlook, 359
Owen, Russell, 198

Paducah News-Democrat, 124
Palmer, Dr. W. B., 143
Parrish, Herbert, 10
Pasadena Broadcaster, 279
Peay, Gov. Austin, 199, 234
Peeples, Rep. Thomas H., 116
Pekor, Charles F., Jr., 134
Peterman, L. J., 152
Petronievic, Dr. Brana, ix
Pezet, A. Washington, 32, 209
Phelps, Rev. Guy Fitch, 345, 354
Phelps, Dr. William H., 308
Phillips, Bruce, 77
Pickens, Prof. A. L., 116
Pierce, Charles, 317
Pierce, David H., 304
Poate, Dr. Ernest M., 108
Pocohantas Star-Herald, 166
Poole, Rep. D. Scott, 90, 93, 109
Poteat, Pres. William L., 98
Potter, Rev. Dr. Charles Francis, 202, 238, 294
Potts, Richard, 174
Powell, Rev. Dr. W. F., 199
Price, George McCready, 19, 207, 364
Prizer, Dr. E. Levis, 375
Providence Journal, 175

Questions and Answers, 289

Rader, Rep. Perry S., 159
Radford, Dr. Robert S., 190
Raleigh News and Observer, 90
Raleigh Times, 108
Rappleyea, George W., 201, 202, 208
Raulston, Judge J. T., 204, 208, 211
Rawlinson, Prof. A. E., 11
Ray, Rep. Jeff D., 112
Reeman, Edmund Henry, 324
Reid, Rev. Dr. John D., 352
Remsburg, John E., 28
Reuterdahl, Dr. Arvid, 314
Reynolds, Pres. H. J., 164
Rice, Dr. John A., 177
Richardson, Rep. L. O., 315
Riley, Rev. Dr. William Bell, 41, 57, 87, 154, 249, 284, 310, 311, 334, 351, 371
Ritchie, Prof. John W., 273
Robbins, Very Rev. Howard Chandler, 285
Roberts, Dr. John Emerson, 369, 384
Robinson, F. E., 210
Robinson, Dr. James Harvey, 189
Rocky Mountain News, 329
Rood, Rev. Paul, 255, 276
Ross, Dr. Edward Allsworth, 310
Roswell Daily Recorder, 341
Rotenberry, Rep. A. L., 165
Rowell, Chester, 216
Russell, Sen. B. M., 70
Russell, Dr. William T., 117
Ryder, David Warren, 101

St. Joseph News-Press, 160

St. Louis Globe-Democrat, 160
St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 160
San Diego Union, 262
San Francisco Bulletin, 367
San Francisco Call, 284
San Francisco Chronicle, 272
San Francisco Daily News, 219, 278
San Francisco Review, 101
Savannah Press, 129
Sayre, Rev. John Nevin, 287
Schaeffer, Dr. A. A., 190
Schaff, Rev. Dr. Philip, 40
School and Society, 325
Schulze, Eldor Paul, 323
Science, 11, 104, 165, 166, 183, 232, 241, 250, 269, 302, 326, 378
Science League of America, 160, 240, 247, 248, 267, 271, 277, 338, 384
Scopes, John Thomas, 201, 203, 206, 209, 211, 223, 236
Scopes, Lela V., 122
Scott, Prof. John G., 331
Scottish Rite Masons, 158
Shattuck, Rep. S. O., 79
Shaw, George Bernard, 13
Sheldon, Rev. Charles M., 250
Sherwood, Dr. Henry Noble, 318
Shuler, Rev. Robert, 253
Sierra Educational News, 244
Signs of the Times, 5, 6, 247
Sills, Pres. Kenneth C. M., 301
Sims, Mayor Walter, 46
Sioux City Journal, 324
Slaten, Dr. Arthur Wakefield, 152, 153
Slosson, Dr. Edwin E., 289, 297, 382
Small, Dr. A. B., 181
Small, Rev. Samuel, 22
Smith, Esther, 123
Smith, Rev. Dr. Hay Watson, 165, 170
Snelling, Dr. Charles, 133
Sothern, Martin, 226
Southern Baptist Convention, 146, 161, 179
Southern California Sigma Xi Association, 269
Spangler, Dr. R. C., 147
Spotswood, Dr. Dillon J., 143
Sprading, Charles T., 9, 22, 30, 40, 88, 251
Sprowls, Dr. Jesse W., 188
Stanley News-Herald, 93, 94
Staton, Chester J., 154
Steiner, Franklin, 11, 30
Stephens, Supt. W. L., 248
Stevens, Doris, 163, 193, 199
Straton, Rev. Dr. John Roach, 48, 56, 284, 290, 294
Street, Del. William A., 149
Stribling, T. S., 195
Summers, Rep. John W., 359
Sumner, Prof. William Graham, 301

Sunday, Rev. William A., 251
Suzzallo, Dr. Henry, 349

Tait, Samuel, 319
Taylor, Rep. J. Will, 213
Tennessee Academy of Sciences, 57, 214, 235
Terrell, Gov. Tom J., 167
Thomas, Augustus, 23
Thompson, Rep. C. O., 143
Tracy, M. E., 16
Trent, Rep. W. R., 335
Truth Seeker, 89, 92, 106, 126, 136, 178, 206, 256, 287, 288, 291, 332
Tull, Rev. E. E., 160
Turlington, Rep. Zeb Vance, 109

Ulen, George C., 315
Unitarian Laymen's League, 260, 297
Upshaw, Rep. W. D., 25, 136, 214

Van Doren, Carl, 133
Van Loon, Hendrik Willem, 4, 205

Walker, Gov. C. M., 136
Walsh, Dr. James G., 284
Walther League, 251
Washburn, George F., 27, 50, 52, 60, 61
Weaver, Pres, Rufus, 135
Weaver, Walter W., 106
Webber, Rep. C. D., 335
Welch, Rev. D. M., 195
Weller, Charles F., 287
Wells, Dr. B. W., 103, 109
Wells, H. G., 126
West, Warren R., 150
West Virginia Conference United Brethren, 146
Western Association of Jewish Ministers, 258
Whaling, Rev. Dr. Thornton, 117
Wheless, Joseph, 41, 42
White, Dr. Andrew D., 188, 282
White, Supt. Walter, 206, 210, 213
Whitenack, C. O., 338
Whitfield, Gov. Henry L., 63
Whitney, Orson F., 340
Wichita Daily Eagle, 328
Wilbur, Pres. Ray Lyman, 275
Williams, Jessie Feiren, 174
Wilson, Cora P., 276
Wilson, T. S., 136
Winchell, Prof. Alexander, 187
Windham, Rep. E. K., 65, 71
Winfield, Pres. G. F., 235
Winrod, Gerald B., 333
Wishart, Rev. Dr. Alfred W., 295, 308
Withrow, W. T., 39
Wittner, Loren H., 360, 363

Woman Citizen, 330
Wood, Supt. Will C., 258, 277
Woodrow, Rev. Dr. James, 117
Woods, Farris H., 154
Workman, Dr. M. T., 178
World's Christian Fundamentals Association, 57, 239

Yakima Republic, 348
Young, H. K., 340

A NOTE ON THE TYPE IN WHICH THIS BOOK IS SET

This book is composed on the Linotype in Bodoni, so-called after its designer, Giambattista Bodoni (1740–1813) a celebrated Italian scholar and printer. Bodoni planned his type especially for use on the more smoothly finished papers that came into vogue late in the eighteenth century and drew his letters with a mechanical regularity that is readily apparent on comparison with the less formal old style. Other characteristics that will be noted are the square serifs without fillet and the marked contrast between the light and heavy strokes.

SET UP AND PRINTED BY THE VAIL-BALLOU PRESS, INC., BINGHAMTON, N. Y. · PAPER MANUFACTURED BY W. C. HAMILTON & SONS, MIQUON, PA., AND FURNISHED BY W. F. ETHERINGTON & CO., NEW YORK · BOUND BY H. WOLFF ESTATE, NEW YORK.

B3622201 78817

BL
262
S4

Shipley, Maynard.
The war on modern science; a short history of the fundamentalist attacks on ...

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT TYLER
BL262.S4
The war on modern science;
0 00 01 0099069 6